

The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL is—Town, 26s.; Country 28s.; with the WEEKLY REPORTER, 52s. Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the Office—cloth, 2s. 6d.; half law calf, 4s. 6d.

All Letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer, though not necessarily for publication.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Provinces, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, MAY 8, 1869.

WE PRINT, in another column, a report of the proceedings at the late anniversary dinner of the United Law Clerks' Society. Lord Chief Justice Bovill testified his appreciation of this excellent institution by presiding on this occasion, though, we understand, at considerable personal inconvenience to himself.

WE PRINT in another column a petition from the Metropolitan and Provincial Law Association to the House of Commons, containing criticisms and suggestions of great importance as to the Attorney-General's Bankruptcy Bill. The importance of the petition is the greater because there is probably no body in existence which contains within itself more practical knowledge of the working of the law of Bankruptcy than this association.

The petition objects first to the constitution of the proposed London Court of Bankruptcy. The objection is, in short that the proposed Court would be above its work. This objection is well worthy of consideration; but as to the suggestion that the present Commissioners should be retained at the London Court of Bankruptcy, we very much doubt whether the petitioners will succeed in bringing the House of Commons to assent to their views.

After touching upon some minor points, the petitioners go on to object that too large a number of matters are by the bill placed in the discretion of a general meeting of creditors, and they also think that the scheme of a committee of inspectors would not work. They suggest that the true control over the trustee ought to be that of the Court. The objection which will be made to this proposal of course will be, that it would re-establish the existing system at once, thereby substituting a trustee for an assignee. The petition deals also with the subject of acts of bankruptcy, and its remarks on this head deserve full attention. It points out, as we have already done, that the proposed definition of a trader is entirely defective.

As to the subject of arrangements with creditors, it is pointed out that means ought to be provided for turning a bankruptcy into a liquidation by arrangement. And the absence of such provisions in the bill will, we think, be admitted on all hands to be a defect; the petitioners also object that the existing system of composition deeds ought not to be abolished, and the reasons they give for this have much weight. They also point out, as we have done before, that as the bill stands a liquidation by arrangement would mean the stripping of a debtor of all his property, and handing it over to his creditors to administer, leaving the debtor liable to all his debts, as if nothing had taken place.

The clauses as to after-acquired property are strongly objected to, for various reasons, some of which we think perfectly conclusive. There is another objection, however, to those clauses which courtesy probably restrained the petitioners from dwelling upon, namely, that it is utterly impossible to put any construction upon them which could be worked in practice.

Lastly, the petitioners insist upon a point to which we have already called attention, namely, that inasmuch

as the bill would abolish the relation back of the title of trustees to any period earlier than the Act of Bankruptcy upon which the adjudication is founded, some much more effectual safeguard against fraudulent preferences than the bill affords is absolutely necessary.

ALL FURTHER PROCEEDINGS in the Taunton election petition have been stayed by a rule of the Court of Common Pleas. Upon the argument of the rule it certainly appeared that the reasons for holding that a second petition could not be presented were, on the whole, stronger than we had supposed, and some of the judges suggested reasons why this may have been intended. Without at all questioning the correctness of the decision—indeed a full consideration of the various sections of the statute shows it to be inevitable—yet we must say we still adhere to our former opinion, that it is a *casus omisus*. It is agreed on all hands that until the decision of Mr. Justice Blackburn was given, Mr. James could not have been petitioned against; and it is now held that he could not have been petitioned against after that. The only way, therefore, that an objection could be raised against his being declared duly elected was in the petition in which the seat was claimed for him, and in that petition the question could only be raised by the respondent. The respondent would have the whole control and conduct of the case: there is no power for any one else to intervene; and the question is whether it was intended that the whole constituency should be bound by the manner in which the respondent may conduct the case. The protection which it is suggested the constituency have, is that, in the first place, there are provisions that if the respondent withdraws from the defence before the trial, some one else may be substituted as respondent; and, in the next place, that if at the trial anything takes place to raise the suspicion of the judge, he may exercise his power of calling witnesses. It is further said, that if the decision of the judge could be shown to be obtained by fraud or collusion, it might be set aside, though even in this case there is considerable doubt whether the application ought to be made to the Court, to the judge, or to the House of Commons. Now, all this is true; but for all that, there is no practical defence to the constituency against a disqualified person being declared duly elected. It must always be the first interest of the respondent to save his own seat. Take the present case; it was evident that the line taken by Serjeant Cox's counsel was not so much to represent that anything corrupt had been done on the part of Mr. James, as that the same things had been done on both sides; that they had been done by both openly and *bona fide*, and that on neither side they could be held corrupt. No doubt this was, as far as the respondent was concerned, the most prudent course to take, and a perfectly justifiable one. But it failed, and the consequence of its failure was, that the recriminatory case was not established. We do not, of course, know whether it could have been established or not; but, as it is alleged that it could be, and the constituency, at all events, not to mention the country at large, have an interest in knowing whether it could or not, it is certainly unsatisfactory to find there can be no further inquiry. As regards the supposed protection afforded by the power of the judge to call witnesses, it is quite clear that this must always be, as it has hitherto proved, practically inoperative. The judge has no means of investigating the case beforehand, nor can he know what witnesses to call; so that he cannot intervene, as suggested, in the manner of the Queen's Proctor in divorce suits. The only case in which this provision is likely to be of use is in the case of an important witness whose name has been often mentioned in the inquiry, but whom neither side can rely on, so that each is afraid to call him. In such a case no doubt the judge would call him. No doubt this provision, though not directly acted on, has had already an indirect effect, by inducing respondents to call witnesses whom, but for the power of the judge to insist on their being called, they might have preferred not to put forward. Beyond this

we do not believe the provision in question will ever be called into play. There is, however, one respect in which the judgments upon this rule in the Taunton petition are decidedly satisfactory. They distinctly recognise what we insisted on strongly in our remarks last week, that the issues in an election petition are not mere issues raised between the parties, but issues in which the public have an interest. Therefore, although what we think the great blot in the Act remains unremedied—viz., that there are no effectual provisions against charges made being at the trial withdrawn from investigation, although there are elaborate provisions against their being withdrawn before—yet we do not think we shall again have this done openly, and with the sanction of the judge, as it was in Yorkshire. Beside the Taunton case, the Court of Common Pleas have decided the Salisbury and Manchester petitions on special case. The point attempted to be raised in the Salisbury case was distinctly precluded from being raised on a scrutiny by a section of a statute which happened to be much clearer than they usually are, and we cannot but think that Mr. Quain, who argued for the petitioner, was paying but a poor compliment to the Court in addressing them as he did for a considerable time after they had decided that this objection that the registrar was conclusive was open to his opponent upon the special case. The Manchester case was a more difficult one, and turned upon the construction of the Act 22 Geo. 3, c. 45, disqualifying Government contractors. The firm of which Mr. Birley was a member had supplied goods under a contract with the Secretary of State for India in Council. All the goods had, however, been supplied and accepted before his election, and nothing remained to be done under the contract but to receive payment, the amount of which was agreed on, and which was overdue. The Court upon this held that Mr. Birley did not hold, execute, or enjoy a contract within the meaning of the statute, inasmuch as on his side the contract was executed and not executory. It is obvious that if the contrary construction had prevailed, the Government could have it in their power to exclude permanently from Parliament any contractor by neglecting to pay him in full. The question argued as to whether a contract with the Secretary of State for India in Council would, if executory, have been a contract for or on account of the public service, within the meaning of the Act, was not decided; but the members of the Court obviously inclined to the opinion that it would. The further ground on which it was sought to disqualify Mr. Birley was that his firm had supplied certain articles of domestic utility to an agent of the Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum. It was, however, stated on the case that Mr. Birley himself never heard of the order, and that none of the firm knew that the asylum was a Government institution. The Court held that the severe penalties and the disqualification imposed by the Act could not be incurred unless there was knowledge on the part of the contractor. That the Court was able to arrive at this decision is satisfactory, as the case clearly was not within the mischief of the statute, and we share the opinion expressed by Mr. Justice Montagu Smith, that the provisions of this statute ought to be revised to meet the altered state of things at the present day.

WE HAVE RECEIVED a copy of a petition recently presented to the House of Commons by Mr. Locke, Q.C., M.P., on behalf of Mr. Osgood, late registrar of the City of London Court. It may be remembered that in 1866 certain charges of neglect of duty were preferred against Mr. Osgood, on which charges the Court of Common Council, who, under 15 Vict. c. 77, have jurisdiction in the matter, after some investigation removed Mr. Osgood from his office, which he had held since 1856. Mr. Osgood afterwards made an application to the Court of Queen's Bench for a *quo warranto*, the application was, however, at the suggestion of the Court, turned into a special case. The Court held (17 W. R. 405) that as the

power of removal was clearly with the Court of Common Council—and there having been a specific charge which the party had the opportunity of answering by evidence, and the evidence having been heard—the Court of Queen's Bench could not interfere with the decision on the merits.

But the Court at the same time expressed the strongest opinion (which, unfortunately for Mr. Osgood, it could not embody in any practical relief) that Mr. Osgood had furnished a complete answer before the Common Council to the charges against him, and that the decision of the Common Council was entirely erroneous on the merits. They regretted extremely the hard treatment undoubtedly received by Mr. Osgood, but could give him no assistance. Mr. Osgood's petition, after stating the above facts, prays "that the House will consider his case, and also the expediency of repealing so much of the statute 15 Vict. c. 77, as relates to the salary of, and to the powers of appointing and removing, the registrar of the said City of London Court, and of enacting that the powers of appointment and removal of the registrar of the said City of London Court shall be and be vested in the Lord High Chancellor and exercised by him, as in the case of the metropolitan county courts; and that the registrar of the said City of London Court shall be placed now and from time to time in all other respects upon the same footing as the registrars of the metropolitan county courts."

It is certainly to be desired that the appointment and removal of the registrar City of London Court should be vested, not in the Court of Common Council, but in the Lord Chancellor, as in all the county courts; and that, not so much on account of any particular miscarriage, but because the Lord Chancellor is a decidedly more competent tribunal than the Common Council, and there is no reason why the City Court should stand alone as to this jurisdiction.

THE WRIT OF ERROR in Madame Rachel's case came on for argument before the Court of Queen's Bench a few days ago. Our readers may probably remember that the objections raised to the conviction were three in number. First, it was said that the Central Criminal Court had no power to divide itself; in other words, that only one court could lawfully sit at the same time. This objection the Court at once overruled. Secondly, it was objected that, in consequence of the change effected in the nature of the Sheriff's Court by the last County Court Act, the Mr. Commissioner Kerr was no longer entitled to sit as a Judge of the Central Criminal Court. He sat in the latter court in his capacity of Judge of the Sheriff's Court. But the County Court Act of 1867 changed the Sheriff's Court, so far at least as it was a small debtor court, into the City of London Court. It was contended therefore that Mr. Kerr was no longer Judge of the Sheriff's Court, and therefore no longer entitled to sit at the Old Bailey. Upon this point also the Court at once gave judgment in favour of the Crown. The third question raised was a very curious one. By the Act under which the Court is constituted two or more of the judges of the Court may sit and try prisoners. At the trial of Madame Rachel Mr. Commissioner Kerr presided throughout, and an alderman was present also on each day of the trial, but different aldermen on the different days. This, it is said, was not a good trial before two judges. Upon this point the Court has taken time to consider its judgment. But, whichever way the decision be, the result will be singular enough. If they support the conviction they will decide that certain persons are necessary members of the Court, but it is unimportant whether they hear the trial or not. If they decide against the conviction they will decide that the diligent attendance is necessary as judges, of persons whom the real judge would never allow to meddle for one moment in the case. It is difficult to say which result will be the more complete *reductio ad absurdum* of the constitution of the Court.

THE DOUBT which we suggested a few weeks ago as to the right of Mr. Thom to conduct the prosecution against the Overend & Gurney directors has led to some discussion in the press. The *Money Market Review*, in particular, has taken us to task with especial severity for what we said on the subject. Our contemporary finds fault with us on three grounds. We said that Mr. Thom was the prosecutor, "as any other of her Majesty's subjects might have been." On the other hand, the *Money Market Review* is of opinion that "none of her Majesty's subjects not being parties aggrieved could have prosecuted the accused." Now, the law upon this point is really quite clear. At common law anybody could go straight before a grand jury and prefer a bill of indictment against anybody else for any offence. This state of things led to many inconveniences, by affording too great facilities for vexatious prosecutions. Hence, by the 22 & 23 Vict. c. 17, it was enacted that no one should be entitled to prefer an indictment for offences of certain classes without first taking preliminary proceedings before a magistrate. But as to the persons entitled to bring an indictment, it left the law unchanged. And indictments are not unfrequently preferred by persons having no interest whatever in the matter. Secondly, our contemporary has discovered that we spoke inaccurately about the finding of a true bill by the grand jury, speaking of it as if it were future, whereas it is past. And we confess the offence—we did speak inaccurately. It is true the inaccuracy in no way affected our reasoning; but our contemporary is still entitled to all the credit of having detected an error. Lastly, the *Money Market Review* is quite sure that Mr. Thom is entitled to conduct the case in person. If he perseveres in his present intention the Court will have soon to decide the point. We will, therefore, not discuss the question further at present. We can only say, as we said at first, that we do not see how he can be entitled to do what he proposes.

MR. BARRY'S CASE.

The Irish Court of Common Pleas has withdrawn from the further prosecution of Mr. Barry by discharging the conditional order they made against him. The judges still maintain their position that they were right in instituting the proceedings of their own accord, and that "where a contempt of Court has been committed by any one, whether in the presence of the Court or not, they have jurisdiction to originate proceedings and punish such contempt." Now, we are not concerned to dispute the existence of this jurisdiction, yet we must say the cases quoted by the Chief Justice in his judgment by no means support the proposition in its entirety. They were all cases of offensive letters written to judges or officers of the Court, so that the contempt, if not committed in the presence of the Court in a physical sense, was as directly brought to the notice of the Court by the culprit himself as if it had been. The cases are much like what the present would have been if Mr. Barry had sent a report of his speech to the judges. If he had done that, his sending the report, though not in our opinion, the original speaking of the words would have been a contempt which it would have been the duty of the Court to notice. If, however, the attention of the Court had been called in this way to Mr. Barry's remarks, it would have been a very different thing from the judges "casually," as they say in their judgment, reading the speech in a newspaper. The ground upon which the Court discharged the conditional order was, that Mr. Barry ought not to have been ordered to state on oath what parts of the report he admitted to be correct and what parts were inaccurately reported. The judges say they never intended to make such an order, but only to order that Mr. Barry should be allowed an opportunity of making this statement on oath, and that they do not know how the order came to be drawn up in the form it was. It has not unnaturally been the subject of con-

siderable remark, that an order of this sort should be drawn up without the judges knowing anything about it, and the public not unnaturally suppose that some of the officers of the Court are to blame. We cannot help thinking, however, that the anomalous character of the proceeding entirely explains this matter. There was no prosecutor. In an ordinary case the officer of the Court would draw up an order made in open court from the endorsements made by the counsel on both sides on their briefs. If these endorsements differed, the order would not have been drawn up until the proper form had been ascertained; if they agreed no mistake could occur. Here, however, there were no counsel or briefs, and nothing whatever to guide the officer of the Court, except the oral order pronounced by the judges. Mr. Justice Keogh is reported in the *Irish Law Times and Solicitors' Journal* to have used the expression "be required to state by affidavit," and therefore the mistake of the officer seems not unnatural. When the judges take upon themselves the office of prosecutors, they ought at least to do what the prosecuting counsel, if there had been one, would have done, viz., to see that the order made at their instance is drawn up in proper form.

As the matter ultimately dropped, it would not, but for the importance of the matter to the profession, be worth while commenting on anything beyond the fact of the charge being brought forward in the manner it was. There were, however, many other irregularities in the course taken besides the mere fact of there being no prosecutor. The object, as expressed by the conditional order, was to suspend Mr. Barry from practising as an attorney. This punishment surely is only applicable to professional misconduct, and moreover can only be made on formal proceeding, "In the matter of the attorney." Here the orders all purported to have been made "In the matter of the Youghal Election Petition." We have no wish to defend Mr. Barry, and certainly should not wish to do so if we supposed he had said all that was reported of him; yet we cannot think his speech would be considered to have been made in his capacity of an attorney, or that it would amount to professional misconduct. If Mr. Barry had committed a contempt of Court "in the matter of the Youghal Election Petition," and had been adjudged guilty of it, he might probably have been fined or ordered into custody in a proceeding in that matter. Subsequently he might perhaps have been struck off the rolls or suspended, on proper proceedings being taken, on the ground that a person who had been convicted of a contempt of Court was not a proper person to be an officer of the Court. This would be analogous to the case of striking off the roll an attorney who had been convicted of felony. Whether the circumstances could in any view be considered sufficiently grave to justify such a course, would of course be doubtful; certainly there are numerous cases which would seem to show it would not. This point however we need not deal with; it is the question of the jurisdiction of the Court which more immediately concerns the profession to which many of our readers belong. We apprehend that this case is the first in which it has ever been suggested that a man being charged with any offence, whether felony, misdemeanour, or contempt of Court, could for the offence itself be punished in any other way if he happened to be an attorney than if he were not. The summary jurisdiction of the Courts over the attorneys has always been confined first, to cases of misconduct in their profession, and secondly, to cases where either a conviction for some grave offence has already taken place, or else in some way or other, before a proper tribunal for investigating the case, the attorney has been shown to be an improper person to remain on the roll. In the latter case the jurisdiction is exercised in a further and subsequent proceeding, not as a punishment of the attorney, but to clear the roll of the Court and the profession from any longer including an unfit member. It is therefore not a mere matter of form, but a startling assumption of a new jurisdiction, that the Court should have proposed

in an order made in the Youghal election petition, and as a punishment for a contempt of Court, to suspend Mr. Barry from practising as an attorney. Mr. Butt, in arguing the case, pointed out that the offence charged against Mr. Barry was an indictable one. If he had been indicted, could, in addition to the punishment ordinarily inflicted on a misdemeanant not an attorney, the further punishment of suspension have been inflicted? It is quite clear it could not, and if so, it is equally clear that it could not be inflicted as a direct punishment for the offence upon a prosecution not so regularly conducted as an indictment. We are glad to see that an influential meeting of solicitors has been held at Dublin, at which resolutions were passed protesting against the course taken in this case. These resolutions, while disclaiming any sympathy with the remarks reported to have been made by Mr. Barry, and also recognising the general usefulness of the summary jurisdiction of the Courts over attorneys, strongly protest against an attorney being placed in any different position from another citizen in respect of acts not done in his professional capacity.

MR. BENNETT'S CASES.

The prosecutors of Mr. Bennett, the Vicar of Frome, have within the last fortnight met with two defeats on preliminary points—one in the Queen's Bench, the other in the Court of Arches. The former tribunal was asked for a *mandamus* to the Bishop of London, to compel him to issue a commission of inquiry into certain heresies of which Mr. Bennett was alleged to have been guilty. As it appeared, however, that one commission had already reported against Mr. Bennett, and that proceedings were already pending against him in consequence, concerning matters substantially the same as those now complained of, the Court refused a rule. The motion involved an interesting though, as it turned out, a rather fruitless discussion on the meaning of the Church Discipline Act, c. 86, s. 3, which enacts that in every case of any clerk who may be charged with any offence against the laws ecclesiastical, "it shall be lawful for the bishop of the diocese within which the offence is alleged to have been committed, on the application of any party complaining thereof, or, if he shall think fit of his own mere motion, to issue a commission." It appeared that Mr. Shephard, a resident at Frome, had applied under this section to Dr. Jackson, the Bishop of London, for a commission of inquiry into some doctrines recently avowed and published by Mr. Bennett. The Bishop declined to act, and the object of the application was to compel him to do so. Mr. Stephens argued on behalf of Mr. Shephard that, on the true construction of the above section, a bishop has no discretion except in the case of his initiating a suit "of his own mere motion," and that whenever he is applied to by a person with an unquestionable interest in the matter, he is bound to issue a commission. The Court, however, did not adopt this conclusion. They thought that a bishop has a discretion, and that being so, declined in this case to examine whether he, Dr. Jackson, had properly exercised it. The point is still left open whether under all circumstances a bishop's judgment is to be final. But, in whatever way this may be decided, the instances in which a court of common law would review the episcopal decisions would certainly be very rare. The old jealousy of courts ecclesiastical has vanished, and it would, we are sure, require very strong arguments indeed to induce the Court of Queen's Bench to overrule the lenity of an ordinary towards a clerk subject to his jurisdiction.

There is no doubt that the practical result of the judgment will be to restrain frivolous complaints against clergymen. We are far from saying indeed that Mr. Shephard's complaint was frivolous; but it was undoubtedly rather hard that Mr. Bennett should have two law suits on his hands at the same time. We are,

therefore, glad that the rule for a *mandamus* was refused. There will be ample opportunity for a fresh attack on Mr. Bennett should the proceedings actually instituted fail.

We now turn to the Court of Arches, before which Mr. Bennett's case was on Monday last. In order to estimate the importance of what occurred it is necessary to refer to the previous course which the suit now pending has taken. First of all, the late Bishop of London issued a commission of inquiry, who reported that there was "a *prima facie* ground for instituting further proceedings," to be found in a work published by Mr. Bennett on the diocese of London. That report was in accordance with 3 & 4 Vict. c. 86, s. 5, filed in the registry of the diocese of Bath and Wells, where Mr. Bennett's preferment is situated. The bishop of the latter diocese now had sole cognizance of the matter, and might, if he had so pleased, have proceeded to hear the case, with the assistance of three assessors, in his own court, by virtue of 3 & 4 Will. 4, c. 86, s. 11. He chose, however, to act under the 13th section of that Act, whereby it is provided that "it shall be lawful for the bishop of any diocese in any case, if he shall think fit, either in the first instance, or after the commissioners shall have reported that there is sufficient *prima facie* ground for instituting proceedings, and before the filing of the articles, but not afterwards, to send the case by letters of request to the Court of Appeal of the province, to be there heard and determined according to the law and practice of such Court;" and sent Mr. Bennett's case to the Dean of the Arches by letters of request, unexceptionable in point of form. To the astonishment of the promoters, the judge declined to accept them. The question was really a simple one, and turned entirely on the construction to be placed on the 13th section of the Act. Might the bishop request, and yet the Arches Court refuse to comply? Sir R. Phillimore has held that the enactment is susceptible of this absurd interpretation. Whether he is right or wrong it would be premature, in the absence of a full report of his observations, finally to determine. But it seems to us, at present, that beyond all question the Court of the province must receive a case sent by letters of request from the court of the diocese, and there is nothing in the judgment of Sir R. Phillimore, as reported in the *Times*, to shake this view of the subject. All the old law about letters of request, into which the judge characteristically entered at length, is beside the point; and it matters not whether previous to the passing of the Church Discipline Act the Arches Court had or had not a discretion to refuse them. We believe we may say, in passing, that it had not, and *Steward v. Bateman*, 3 Curt. 201, a case relied on to some extent by the judge, appears to us to prove the contrary of the proposition he used it to establish. (See 3 Curt. p. 205). But in truth the ancient character of letters of request is not worth investigation. The statute now governs the matter, and with all respect to the learned Dean of the Arches, we venture to maintain that whatever may have been the law, it is now imperative on the Court of Arches to accept letters of request which are regular in form. Probably there will be an appeal from the recent decision to the Privy Council; and if there be, we have little hesitation in prophesying that it will be reversed.

JUDGMENTS ON ELECTION PETITIONS.—The first part of a series, containing the shorthand writers' notes of the judgments delivered by the judges on the trial of the election petitions of this Session, has been issued as a Parliamentary paper. It gives the judgments on thirty election petitions, twenty-six relating to English boroughs—Beverley, Bewdley, Blackburn, Bodmin, Bradford (2), Bridgwater, Cheltenham, Coventry, Dover, Guildford, Hereford, Lynn, Lichfield, Norwich, Oldham, Penryn, Salford, Staleybridge, Tamworth, Wallingford, Warrington, Westbury, Westminster, Wigan, Windsor; one relates to a Scottish borough election—Greenock; and three relate to Irish borough elections—Dublin, Sligo, Wexford. The judges reported the extensive prevalence of corrupt practices in Beverley, Bewdley, Bridgwater, Dublin (among the freemen), and Sligo.

COURTS.

COURT OF CHANCERY.

STATEMENT OF THE NUMBER OF CAUSES, PETITIONS, &c., disposed of in Court in the week ending Thursday, May 6, 1869.

L. C.		L. J.		M. R.		V. C. S.		V. C. M.		V. C. J.	
AP.	AP. M.	AP.	AP. M.	C.	P.	C.	P.	C.	P.	C.	P.
2	0	0	0	32	16	10	16	11	16	21	19

COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH.

(Before COCKBURN, C.J., LUSH, HANNEN, and HAYES, JJ.)

April 30.—*Saurin v. Star—Mellish, Q.C.*, obtained a rule in the following terms:—"Rule to show cause why the verdict should not be entered for the defendants on the third and fourth counts, on the ground, as to the third count, that the right of the plaintiff, as a member of the society mentioned in the third count depended on contract, and that there was no consideration for such contract, and that if there was the consideration was contrary to the policy of the law, and one which could not be enforced, and that the alleged conspiracy was a conspiracy to deprive the plaintiff of something to which she was not entitled; and, in the fourth count, on the ground that there was no evidence of the libel in that count, or that the defendants joined in publishing the libel, or why there should not be a new trial if the defendants are held to be entitled to succeed on one of the new counts only, and why the damages should not be reduced to £200, on the ground that the jury could not include in the damages the money paid to the Baggot-street convent."

The Overend & Gurney Prosecution.

Sir J. B. Karlake, Q.C., moved on the part of one of the defendants (the others consenting) for a rule to bring the case on for trial at the sittings after Trinity Term. He moved, he said, on the ground that the matter was one of the deepest importance to the defendants, and that the applicant was anxious to have it tried as soon as possible.

The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE said the defendants had had the case removed by *certiorari* from the Central Criminal Court, where it would have been tried before this; and that being so, as it was a case likely to take many days, it would be a serious thing to displace the cases of the other sutors in this court in favour of this particular case. The only thing which occurred to him was this, that if the *venue* could be changed to Middlesex, and one of his learned brethren would sit for him in London, he might try the case in this court. But, then, that could not be done without the consent of all the parties. Perhaps the learned counsel had better see whether the parties would consent to some such course being taken, otherwise he saw great difficulty in the way.

The matter accordingly stood over.

(In Banco, before the LORD CHIEF JUSTICE, LUSH, and HAYES, JJ.)

May 6.—*Ex parte Levenson.*

This was an application by Sarah Levenson (Madame Rachel) against Mr. Joseph Haynes, sometime her attorney, on the ground of alleged misconduct on his part. Indeed, she actually imputed to him that the frauds alleged to have been committed by her were, in reality, committed by him, and that he, while acting as her attorney, had entered into a conspiracy against her, being largely indebted to her.

The matter had been referred to the Master, and Master Manley Smith now read an elaborate report, the result of which was that there was nothing to affect the substantial justice of the conviction of Sarah Levenson, and there was no ground for the interference of the Court.

This report having been read,

Gibbons, for the applicant, made an attempt to support her case for an account, but

The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE said that as the Master had reported that he was not satisfied that any money was due to the applicant at all, it was impossible that this application could be sustained.

Hawkins, Q.C. (Hence with him) for Mr. Haynes, having commented on the grave character of the charges made

against him, and the utter absence of any evidence to support them, asked that the application should be discharged with costs.

Rule discharged with costs.

[We have received from Mr. Haynes a copy of the Master's report, with a request for a notice in our columns. The report is extremely long, and it will be sufficient to make the following extracts:—

1. "I find that the charge against Mr. Haynes of having received £20,000 or £30,000 on account of Mrs. Levenson, and refusing to account for it is quite unfounded. I believe he never received any money on her account before June, 1866."

2. "It is for the Court to say whether or no Mr. Haynes is entitled to charge Mrs. Levenson with £1,100, which the Master finds he has repaid to Mrs. Borradaile since the conviction."

3. "I also find the charge of conspiracy against Mr. Haynes to be unfounded."

The report then investigates this charge, and pronounces it "unfounded and untrue." *Apròpos* of Mr. Haynes' statements in paragraph 2 of his affidavit in answer to the rule of 26th January, the Master says—"These statements certainly expose Mr. Haynes to a charge of want of candour in dealing with the Court; but when the whole truth is ascertained there appears to be really no ground for the charge against him of having lent or said he had lent Mrs. Levenson's money upon this security (the premises in Bond-street), which is probably the reason why he did not further allude to it. There was, in literal truth, as he says, no transfer of a mortgage to him."

66. "I cannot conclude this report without remarking that had Mr. Haynes' books been properly kept the difficulties which have arisen in adjusting the accounts between him and Mrs. Levenson would not have occurred, and much valuable time would have been saved."

"CHAS. MANLEY SMITH."]

MIDDLESEX SESSIONS.

The Haymarket Houses.—Mr. Knox and the Middlesex Magistrates.

April 30.—At the rising of the Court to-day,

The ASSISTANT-JUDGE, (Sir W. H. Bodkin) said there are two cases in the paper of appeals against convictions by Mr. Knox, for causing, or allowing, prostitutes to assemble, and upon these two cases being called, counsel intimated that the solicitors of the Commissioners of Police had written a letter to say that they should not support those convictions. Under those circumstances, no other course was open to us than to quash them. But I mention the fact now because these convictions have been a subject of considerable comment, and of interrogation in the House of Commons. I can only say that there is no law in these cases at all. It is entirely a question of fact, and each case must stand upon its own merits. On one occasion we quashed a conviction on the hearing, and upon that decision a great deal has been said. The sole evidence there was that a policeman went into the house between twelve and one and found men and women having refreshment, some of the women being prostitutes. No question was asked, and there was nothing to show that the person who kept the house knew they were prostitutes. There was nothing to show that any warning had been previously given against harbouring or encouraging them to come. There was no ringing of any bell to give notice of the approach of the police. In fact, there was nothing but the mere incident that the police, before the hour of one, when these houses should be closed, found persons in them taking refreshments—some of those persons being prostitutes. Although I do not shrink from taking on myself the chief responsibility, there were many magistrates present who formed their own opinion upon the question, which was a question of fact, and it seemed so clearly not to be a case which satisfied the requirements of the law, that we did not call upon the counsel for the appellants, but at once quashed the conviction. Indeed after all that has been said, I have no hesitation in stating that if another case came here and was presented to us in such a bald and unsatisfactory manner we should again quash the conviction. We are as desirous as Mr. Knox to put an end to any nuisance, whether in the Haymarket or elsewhere; but we cannot forget that we are in a court of law, bound to act upon such testimony as is sworn before us, and not to em-

bark upon inquiries of another kind. There was not a tittle of evidence as to ringing a bell or of anything more than persons taking refreshment within the hours allowed by law, some of those persons being "unfortunates." I do not think that any bench of magistrates in the kingdom could, under the circumstances, have arrived at a different conclusion. If other cases come before us we shall treat them as we treated the last, according to the effect of the sworn evidence in court, and in no other way. I am very sorry if our decision should have induced Mr. Knox, for whom I entertain a great respect, to abstain from convicting in other cases, unless those were cases of the same bald and unsatisfactory character as that which we decided. There were two cases for hearing to-day, and I thought we might have had some further evidence to justify the conclusion to which Mr. Knox came; but when they are called on we find that there is no evidence forthcoming, and that a letter has been written to say that no attempt will be made to sustain those convictions. I have nothing more to say than this, that as in the last case we decided on the real merits of the question as proved by testimony before us, so we shall endeavour to decide when any similar case is submitted to this Court.

COUNTY COURTS.

LAMBETH.

(Before J. PITT TAYLOR, Esq., Judge.)

May 4.—*Simmonds and Another v. Suggett.*

In bankruptcy a creditor did not prove his debt, but subsequently the bankrupt paid a portion of the debt; he then incurred another debt with the same creditor, who brought an action to recover it, whereupon the bankrupt pleaded a set-off to the amount of the money paid on account of the former debt. Held, that the set-off was void and of no effect.

This was a claim for £10 10s. for goods sold and delivered. *E. Lucas*, for the defendant, said he admitted the claim, but had put in a plea of set-off under rather peculiar circumstances. In July, 1864, the defendant became bankrupt, owing to the plaintiffs the sum of £19 6s. The plaintiffs did not prove their debt, and defendant was not bound to pay any portion of it. He obtained his order of discharge in January, 1865. Afterwards at various times up to January, 1867, defendant paid £10 10s. on account of this unproved debt. These payments the learned counsel submitted would be set-off against the present claim as money had and received, it having been paid to the plaintiffs without consideration, and without any obligation to pay on the part of the defendant.

Mr. Hilleary (Hilleary & Tunstall) submitted that the plea of set-off was bad. The defendant paid the £10 10s. voluntarily nearly two years before the present cause of action arose in October and December of last year. If the defendant had done wrong or more than he was legally bound to do he could not now take advantage of that wrong. It was a sufficient answer to say that if the present cause of action had never arisen the defendant would have had no remedy against the plaintiffs in respect of the set-off.

Mr. PITT TAYLOR said the plaintiffs had furnished a sufficient answer to the plea of set-off, and the judgment must be for them with costs.

APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. ROBERT LAWRENCE, of Oban, Argyll, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer oaths in Chancery in England.

Mr. CHARLES COLYER, of 8, Furnival's-inn, has been appointed a perpetual commissioner for taking the acknowledgments of deeds by married women, in and for the city of London, also in and for the counties of Middlesex and Kent, and the city and liberties of Westminster.

Mr. JOHN EDWARDS PRICE, of Pontypridd, Glamorgan, has been appointed a Perpetual Commissioner for taking the acknowledgments of deeds by married women, in and for the county of Glamorgan.

Mr. EDMUND ATKINSON GRUNDY, solicitor, of Manchester, has been appointed by the Lord Chancellor of Ireland, to be a Commissioner Extraordinary for receiving affidavits at Manchester for the Irish Court of Chancery. Mr. Grundy was certificated as a solicitor in Hilary Term, 1860, and is

registrar of the county court held at Bury, in Lancashire, and also Clerk to the Magistrates of Bury and Heywood.

Mr. CHARLES NUTTALL, solicitor, of Manchester, has been appointed by the Lord Chancellor of Ireland to be a Commissioner Extraordinary for receiving affidavits at Manchester for the Irish Court of Chancery. Mr. Nuttall's certificate as an attorney was taken out in Hilary Term, 1863, and he is also a Commissioner for taking affidavits for the English Courts.

Mr. JAMES MARTIN, late First Minister and Attorney-General in the colony of New South Wales, has received the honour of Knighthood by letters patent.

GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE.

THE BISHOP OF NATAL.

Sir,—Your suggestion that Bishop Colenso could be tried by commissioners specially appointed by the Crown deserves a more attentive examination than it has yet received. The 16 Car. 1, c. 11, merely repealed the 18th section of the 1 Eliz. c. 1, authorising the Crown to appoint a Court of High Commission, and enacted that "no new Court should be erected which should have the like power, jurisdiction, or authority as the said High Commission Court had, or pretended to have," leaving unrepealed the 17th section of 1 Eliz. c. 1, which annexed to the Crown all "such jurisdiction, privileges, superiorities, and pre-eminences as by any spiritual or ecclesiastical power or authority had theretofore been or might lawfully be exercised or used." Moreover, the 4th section of this Act of Car. 1, in depriving all ecclesiastical judges of the power of inflicting fines, imprisonments, and other corporal punishments, enumerated among these ecclesiastical judges (besides the archbishops, bishops, &c., and their chancellors, &c., and other ordinaries) "any other persons exercising spiritual or ecclesiastical power, authority, or jurisdiction, by any grant, licence, or commission of the King, his heirs or successors, or by any power or authority derived from the King, his heirs, or successors, or otherwise." The 13 Car. 2, c. 12, repealed the 16 Car. 1, c. 11, "excepting what concerns the High Commission Court, or the new erection of some such like Court by commission;" and the declaration of rights (1 Wm. & Mary, sess. 2, c. 2) declared that the commission issued by James 2, for erecting a Court of Commissioners for ecclesiastical causes, and all other commissions and courts of a like nature, were illegal and pernicious; but neither of these enactments in terms touched the Crown's authority to appoint special commissioners to exercise spiritual jurisdiction in a particular case, an authority which the ecclesiastical authorities before the Reformation unquestionably possessed, and which had been repeatedly exercised by Henry VIII. and Edward VI. After the establishment of the Court of High Commission these special commissions would necessarily become rare. James I. appointed a special commission in *Archbishop Abbot's case*, 2 Cardwell's Documentary Annals, and the continued existence of the power to appoint commissioners was, as I have shown, recognised in the 16th Car. 1, c. 11 itself. There can be no question that the Crown's authority to appoint delegates to hear appeals under the 25 Henry 8, c. 19, was not affected by any of these enactments of Charles I., Charles II., and William and Mary, and it is not easy to see how those enactments could operate differently upon a special commission to hear an appeal and upon a similar commission to hear a case in the first instance, the Crown's authority in each case being given by an Act of Parliament which was not expressly repealed.

In the *Bishop of Natal's Case*, 3 Moore P. C. N. S. 154, the Judicial Committee deduced from the 16th Car. 1, c. 11, that the Crown had now no authority to erect a new ecclesiastical tribunal or jurisdiction; but, of course, in that case the question was to a general ecclesiastical jurisdiction given to the Bishop of Capetown, and not as to a jurisdiction given to Commissioners over a particular case.

It is to be regretted that the eminent counsel whose opinion has been recently published have not explained more fully their reason for extending the enactments about the Court of High Commission to all modes whatsoever which the Crown could exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

One curious result which seems to follow necessarily from the recently-published opinion is, that the English law does not provide, and has not since the 16th Car. 1, c. 11,

provided any means of trying an Archbishop for any ecclesiastical offence whatever. This is a theoretical absurdity which, if it exist, ought to be remedied at once, however improbable it may be that it should lead to any practical consequences. But having regard to the history of Archbishop's Grindal, Abbot, and Laud, it is very improbable that either the long Parliament or the statesmen of Charles II. should have given this immunity from ecclesiastical proceedings to archbishops.

A BARRISTER.

PARLIAMENT AND LEGISLATION.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

April 30.—*Fine Arts Copyright Consolidation and Amendment (No. 2) Bill.* Lord Westbury moved the second reading. The bill was cordially approved by the artists and interested classes. The existing law was confused and defective. In England works of art of a particular class enjoyed protection for 28 years, with a contingent extension for another 7 years; that protection extended in France to 50, in Germany to 30, in Belgium to 20, and in Spain to 25 years in excess of the author's life, while in Italy it lasted 40 years, with a contingent extension of 40 years longer. No attempt was made in England to create copyright until 1714, nor as regarded works of art until 1735. In 1714 literary copyright for 14 years was established, this being afterwards extended to 28 years, and in 1842, thanks to Mr. Justice Talfourd and Earl Stanhope, to 42 years, or to 7 years after the author's life, whichever happened to be the longer period. In 1735 copyright for 15 years was given to works of art, but the Act, which was commonly known as Hogarth's Act, the passing of it being entirely due to his exertions, was unfortunately so worded as to protect only engravings in which there was an original design. This was probably attributable to Hogarth being in the habit of composing as he engraved. This restriction was afterwards removed, and the term was extended to 28 years, but no attempt was made to give protection to sculpture till 1798. Sculpture and engravings were commonly supposed to stand on the same footing, but the former enjoyed a copyright for only 14 years, with a further term of 14 years contingent on the artist's life. In 1862 protection was given to paintings, pictures, and photographs for the author's life and a period of 7 years afterwards.

After giving the requisite definitions, the bill proposed that authors of original works of fine art hereafter made or sold should have a copyright for the term of their natural lives and for thirty years subsequently. Then there were provisions as to the transfer of copyright, it being laid down that no such contract should authorise the author to make any repetition of the work unless such should have been expressly reserved. The bill also allowed an artist to retain his property in unfinished sketches and studies made for and previously to the execution of his registered work, without prejudice to his copyright, and it provided that sketches, studies, and unfinished works to the value of £15 should not be subject to seizure in the event of the artist's bankruptcy or of his suffering distraint for debt. The 5th clause confirmed a decision which had been deemed of questionable authority, exempting engravings published as parts of a book from the provisions of the Engraving Acts. Of engravings published separately a proof must be deposited at the British Museum. The 6th clause defined how copyright might be assigned, the schedule containing some short forms of instruments for that purpose; and the 7th provided that in any contract disposing of a copyright it should be implied that the work was the original design of the author, and that the copyright had not previously been infringed or prejudiced. The 8th laid down that no action should be maintainable by the proprietor of a copyright until after registration, the registered proprietor under any licence being nevertheless able to sue or be sued in his own name in any matter arising out of such contract, and the omission to register not otherwise affecting the copyright or licence. Next came the penalties, which, except one or two additions, were taken from the Act of 1862, and then followed provisions directed against the common fraud of affixing names, initials, or monograms purporting to be those of persons who did not really execute the work, as also against the disposal of works of art under false representations. There was also a provision against a very ingenious mode of fraud which was sometimes resorted to—that of altering any work

of art and then offering it for sale as an unaltered work of the author. The next provision was directed at the fraudulent practice of publishing an engraving with the stipulation that the number of copies should be limited, and then of printing a much larger number; and the following provisions prohibited the sale of impressions from a plate retouched or wrought afresh as proof impressions or copies of such engraving. The 11th clause prohibited the importation of piratical copies of copyright works, and the 12th extended to works of art the protection already given at the Custom-house to works of literature. The 13th clause applied to the importers of pirated copies the machinery of the Mercantile Marks Act, obliging them to reveal the names of the persons from whom they were obtained. The succeeding clauses empowered justices to grant search warrants for piratical copies, and also empowered the seizure of piratical copies in the possession of hawkers. Then there were provisions as to registration and as to legal proceedings instituted under the Act with the view of giving a cheap and easy remedy.

The bill was read a second time.

Land Clauses Consolidation Act Amendment Bill.—Committee.

The Earl of Kimberley said that last year a provision was inserted that the taxing masters should levy certain fees and appropriate them to their own use; but for many years it had been the policy of Parliament to substitute fixed salaries for a system of fees, and as it was exceedingly inconvenient that there should be one particular case of breach of this regulation, it was now proposed that that part of the Act of last year should be repealed. The judges would have the power to fix the fees, which would be paid by means of stamps.

The bill passed through committee.

The State of Ireland.—Viscount Lifford drew attention to the late outrages in Ireland, and asked what action the Government would take on the late speech of the Mayor of Cork at a banquet given to released Fenian convicts.

Earl Granville said the Government were determined to put into practice all the provisions of the present law, and were in earnest communication with the Government in Ireland in order to ascertain whether it be expedient or not to take any further legislation for the purpose of putting down outrages of so terrible and lamentable a character as those which have lately occurred.

Lord Cairns, said, supposing the reports to be reliable as to the Mayor of Cork's language, the only course was for the Attorney-General for Ireland to file an *ex officio* information in the Queen's Bench. As to the murders which had taken place, it must not be thought that sending down police to the same was the only remedy to be applied. The police were sent, at the expense of the victim's family, while the perpetrators escaped scot free. But the case was worse than that because the source from which the payment is made is the county cess, and if the burden should possibly go beyond the occupiers it falls on the owners of the land, whose security for the receipt of their rent is made less through the heavier county cess occasioned by this proceeding. He hoped that the Government would, without any kind of delay, if they were not satisfied with the powers they possessed, apply to Parliament to increase them.

May 3.—*Disabled Bishops.*—The Duke of Somerset asked whether any arrangement was in contemplation with reference to three right rev. prelates in south-western dioceses who had for some time been incapacitated by illness from the performance of their duties.

The Archbishop of Canterbury said the Government had been in communication with him as to the best mode of draughting a bill whereby it would be possible for prelates disabled by age or infirmity to be relieved from the discharge of their duties.

Earl Granville wished it to be understood that this bill now being prepared by communication between the most rev. prelate and the Prime Minister dealt solely with the question of bishops incapacitated from physical or mental causes from discharging the duties of their dioceses.

The Land Clauses Consolidation Act Amendment Bill was reported with amendments.

May 4.—*The Sea Birds' Preservation Bill* passed through committee.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

April 30.—*The State of Ireland.*—Mr. Graves called attention to the subject.

Youghal Election.—The motion for a new writ being opposed.

The Attorney-General for Ireland said it would be unreasonable to suspend the writ in this case; it was incumbent upon the House to abide by the legislation of last session; the report of the judge was most unequivocal as to the non-existence of general corruption.

On a division the motion was carried by a division of 192 to 70.

May 3.—*The Irish Church Bill.*—Clauses 30 (mixed endowments) and 31 (limitation of right to purchase fee simple in consideration of perpetual rent) were agreed to. Clause 32 (sale of tithe rent-charge to landowners), a motion to substitute eighteen for twenty-two and a half years' purchase was negatived, and the clause passed with some slight amendments. Clause 33 (commissioners' power of sale) was agreed to with slight amendments. Clause 34 (payment of the money into the bank) was agreed to. Clause 35 (commissioners' accounts) was postponed. Clause 36 (compensation to Nonconformist ministers) was agreed to with some amendment. Clause 37 (compensation to Belfast College professors) was struck out, the subject to be dealt with later. Clause 38 was agreed to.

Progress was then reported.

May 4.—*The Irish Church Bill* adjourned Committee. Clause 39 (Maynooth Repeal and Compensation). Mr. Whalley proposed to remove from the clause the words which would except from the repeal of the Maynooth Acts sections 1, 2, and 3 of 8 & 9 Vict. c. 25. The amendment was rejected by a majority of 324 to 196.

Mr. Gladstone obtained the addition of some words providing what had been originally included in clause 37 (Belfast College professors). After some further amendments in detail, the clause was agreed to. Progress reported.

Recorders' Deputies.—A bill by Mr. Denman to extend to recorders the power to appoint deputies in certain cases was read a first time.

The Libel Bill.—The House went into Committee on this bill *pro forma*, and its clauses were amended.

The Municipal Franchise Bill, to reduce the qualification term of three years' residence to one year, and thus make the Parliamentary and municipal qualification in respect of residence similar, was read a second time.

May 5.—*The Mayor of Cork—The O'Sullivan Disability Bill*, to disable Daniel O'Sullivan, Esq., from holding, enjoying, or taking the office of mayor or justice of the peace, or any office or place of magistracy in the city of Cork or elsewhere in Ireland, was read the first time, and ordered to be served on Mr. O'Sullivan.

The Recorders' Deputies Bill was read a second time.

May 6.—*The Irish Church Bill.*—Adjourned committee. Clause 39 (Maynooth) resumed.

An amendment by Sir G. Jenkinson raising the question whether the compensations shall be paid out of the funds of the Irish Church or from the Consolidated Fund was rejected by a majority of 318 to 192. An amendment by Mr. Sinclair Aytoun to substitute for the grant of a lump sum a plan for compensating the individual life interests of professors and students was rejected by a majority of 365 to 198. The remaining amendments were then withdrawn and the clause passed. The clauses up to 57 were then agreed to with verbal amendments; clause 44 receiving an amendment by the Marquis of Hamilton to secure compensation to deputy registrars who, for five years or upwards, had discharged the duties of registrar, the compensation to be paid by the Commissioners, and to be deducted from the amount payable under the Act to the principal registrar—and a similar amendment by Serjeant Dowse with regard to clerks in the provincial or diocesan registries.

The Mines Regulation Bill.—Mr. Bruce moved the second reading of this bill, which he said was a Consolidation Bill of existing statutes, embodying certain amendments in the law recommended by the Select Committee, and referring only to mines comprised within the existing Mines Regulation Acts. It would be convenient to take the second reading now, on the understanding that full opportunity would be given for discussion on going into committee.

The bill was then read a second time.

The Mayor of Cork.—On the motion of the Attorney-General for Ireland, it was resolved that witnesses in the Mayor of Cork's case be ordered to attend the House

on Tuesday next, and that the Attorney-General be empowered to employ counsel to support the allegations on which the bill introduced for the purpose of removing him from office is based.

IRELAND.

SOCIETY OF THE ATTORNEYS AND SOLICITORS OF IRELAND.

On Tuesday a general meeting of this society was held for the purpose of "taking into consideration the conditional order made in the matter of the Youghal election petition and Mr. James Barry, and the proceedings of the Court of Common Pleas in relation thereto." There was a numerous attendance of the profession.

Sir Richard J. T. Orpen, Knt., President of the Society, occupied the chair.

Mr. Goddard, the secretary, having read the requisition upon which the meeting was convened,

Mr. Roche moved, and Mr. T. Hinds seconded the following resolution:—

"That this meeting, entirely disapproving of, and repudiating the language complained of by the Court of Common Pleas, as read by Mr. Justice Keogh, in the matter of the Youghal election petition, on the 21st of April last, feel it to be their duty, having regard to the interests of the profession of attorneys and solicitors, to protest in the strongest manner against the exceptional and, as this meeting believes, unconstitutional jurisdiction claimed by the Court, of making, without evidence, an order upon one of its own attorneys to attend and answer an allegation of misconduct, and of seeking to fix upon the acts on which the charges made against him were based the character of being done in a professional capacity, so as to subject him, if found guilty, to the serious punishment of suspension, where justice could have been as effectually vindicated by proceeding against him as an ordinary citizen, in which event he would not be deprived of those constitutional safeguards which are the right and privilege of every member of the community."

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

Mr. John Swanzy moved, and Mr. Findlater seconded, the next resolution:—

"We are of opinion that if any judge or court of law or equity has the jurisdiction or power to proceed in a summary manner against an attorney or solicitor as such on a charge or allegation unconnected with the practice of his profession, it is desirable that such an unconstitutional power should no longer exist, and that we should petition against it, or proceed in such manner as is most likely to have it abolished."

The resolution was also unanimously adopted.

Mr. W. J. Cooper proposed, and Mr. Clay seconded, the next resolution:—

"That we think it right and just that an appeal should be allowed from the judgment or order of any court or judge whereby the character or conduct of a solicitor or attorney in his professional capacity may be affected or impeached."

Mr. Thorpe hoped the meeting would not separate without referring it to the council of the society to prepare a bill, whether declaratory of rights or remedying defects in the law. It was to be observed that the very able man who gave the final decision on the case in question cautiously reserved to himself the right of depriving an attorney of the means of earning his bread, if, in the discretion of the Court, they pleased to do it, notwithstanding that he had not acted on the occasion in his professional capacity.

The Chairman said the second resolution declared that they should petition, or take such other course as might be deemed necessary.

The proceedings then terminated.

OBITUARY.

THE RIGHT HON. T. L. LEFROY.

This venerable judge, who was for many years Lord Chief Justice of the Court of Queen's Bench in Ireland, expired at Bray, near Dublin, on the 4th inst., having reached the patriarchal age of ninety-six years. The Right Hon. Thomas Langlois Lefroy, LL.D., was the eldest son

of Colonel Anthony Lefroy, of Limerick, and was descended from an elder branch of the Lefroys (a family of Huguenot extraction), formerly seated in Kent, and now in Hants. He was born in 1776, and received his education at Trinity College, Dublin, where he attained high academical distinction, having received the gold medal in 1795. He was called to the Bar in Ireland, in Easter Term, 1797, and was appointed a King's Counsel in 1815, and Serjeant-at-Law in 1818, being in the following year elected a Benchers of King's Inns, Dublin. In 1830 he entered Parliament as M.P. for the University of Dublin, and continued to represent that constituency till December, 1841, when he was appointed, by the Government of Sir Robert Peel, a Baron of the Irish Court of Exchequer, and in February, 1852, on the first administration of Lord Derby being formed, he was promoted to be Lord Chief Justice of Ireland, in succession to the Right Hon. Francis Blackburne, who then became Lord Chancellor. This office he continued to hold, notwithstanding persistent efforts to compel his resignation on the score of advanced years, till July, 1866, when he resigned on the formation of Lord Derby's third administration, and was succeeded by the Right Hon. James Whiteside, who was Attorney-General for Ireland in 1858-9. The deceased judge married, in 1799, Mary, only daughter and heiress of Jeffrey Paul, Esq., of Silverspring, co. Wexford, his eldest son by whom is Anthony Lefroy, LL.D., who has been M.P. for the University of Dublin since 1865. Another of his sons is Mr. Thomas Lefroy, of the Irish Bar, chairman of Quarter Sessions for the county of Kildare. From 1802 to 1806 the late judge, in conjunction with Mr. Schoales, reported the decisions of Lord Redesdale in the Court of Chancery in Ireland.

SOCIETIES AND INSTITUTIONS.

UNITED LAW CLERKS' SOCIETY.

The thirty-seventh anniversary festival of this Society was held on Monday evening at the Freemasons' Tavern, under the presidency of Lord Chief Justice Bovill.

There were present Mr. Baron Pigott, Mr. Forsyth, Q.C., Mr. Pridaux, Q.C., Mr. Joshua Williams, Q.C., Mr. Keane, Q.C., Mr. Thos. Mellor, Mr. Milward, Q.C., Mr. Horace Lloyd, Q.C., Mr. Webster, Q.C., Dr. Sharp, Mr. Will, Dr. Stallard, Mr. Rodwell, Mr. Batten, Mr. Morgan Howard, Mr. Butler Rigby, Mr. Gregory, M.P.; and Messrs. Bircam, Maynard, Dalrymple, E. Bromley, Tucker, Bolton, Freshfield, Addison, Webb, Flavell, S. Bircam, Maynard, jun., Wyke-Smith, Clulow, Teesdale, Milner, Williams, Edwards, Spenser, Lewin, Buckland, Tamplin, Wilson, Crombie, Mozley, Powell, White, Williams, and others.

After the customary loyal and patriotic toasts,

The CHAIRMAN, who had manifestly only partially recovered from recent indisposition, in proposing the toast of the evening, "Prosperity to the United Law Clerks' Society," said—Gentlemen, I most heartily congratulate the United Law Clerks' Society upon this vast assemblage; not only of members, but of visitors, who are met together here in order to promote the objects of this important association, attesting by their presence the interest which they take in it, and giving a guarantee for a continuance of that support which the institution has hitherto received. There are few societies connected with the law which recommend themselves more to the feelings of those who are associated with the profession than that which is the object of our assembling together. It originated amongst the clerks themselves some thirty-seven years ago, when a few men, having the interest of their brethren at heart, thought that a nucleus might be formed, around which the profession would rally, and thus enable the law clerks to found an institution which, commending itself to the profession at large, should be the means of securing comfort in adversity to those who chose to enrol themselves in its ranks. But their sympathies took a wider range; and they did not forget that there were those beyond the pale of the society who needed assistance and comfort. Those who have to labour from day to day, whose wages are all to which they have to look, have to provide against a time of sickness, when their slender means, unassisted by the aid of the society, would render them a prey to the greatest misery, and produce the greatest state of unhappiness to themselves and to their families. We all know, I especially at this moment know, what it is to be laid upon a bed of sickness; but there are many members of the United Law

Clerks' Society not placed in the same position of fortune, or comfort, or happiness, but whose family ties are equal, or perhaps still greater, and there is no scene that can be more terrible to contemplate than that of a man who has, through a long life, devoted himself with integrity and earnestness to the interest of those whom he serves, at last deprived of the means of supporting himself and his family. I am not surprised, therefore, that men of intelligence, who take an interest, not only in themselves and their families, but in others too, should have directed their minds to the promotion of a society of this kind, which is, to some extent at least, if its object be attained, a means of securing at a future time, some small provision against that want and misery which otherwise must overtake so many. The first provision against sickness, and against temporary distress, this society affords, by way of immediate and certain relief; not only so, but when old age or confirmed illness shall incapacitate any of the members from pursuing their ordinary avocations, it furnishes for the remainder of man's life a provision, not ample, but one which will secure him against want. Again, when old age and infirmity have run their course, and a more solemn scene awaits a man, there is some provision for those whom he leaves behind. I can conceive no objects which recommend themselves more to those who are engaged in the profession, than those which I have referred to, with the additional proud advantage which the society possesses of being able to distribute funds among those who have not been sufficiently provident. If I were asked by what means this society would best extend its usefulness, and promote the advantages which it holds out, I should say it would be by increasing the number of the subscribing members of the society; and I would earnestly impress upon every member who is present to-night, or who may ever read the words which I now utter, the great importance to the society and the profession of endeavouring to persuade all those with whom they are associated to join this society. I believe that if every present member of the society would use his influence with those with whom he comes in contact, and especially those who are young, to join the society at an early age, this institution would be still more flourishing than it is, and would have greater claims upon the profession than those which it now possesses. I would ask those, of whom there are a great number assembled at this table, who employ clerks, to persuade their clerks and give them encouragement to join a society which has been so useful, and I trust will continue to be so useful and advantageous to the clerks of the profession. I know that some, at least, of the great employers of clerical labour in the legal profession have not only encouraged their clerks, but have actually offered to pay a considerable portion of the necessary subscription, in order to induce those clerks to join the society. It passes my comprehension to understand how any young man entering the profession can abstain from taking advantage of so liberal an offer. But I regret to find that hitherto such has been the case in some instances. I know that a good example has been set by one at least of the trustees of this society, who has taken a warm interest in your welfare, and I trust that that example may be followed by others; so that increased and additional support shall be given, not only by those who are now members of the United Law Clerks' Society, to enlarge the area of that society and increase its members, so as to give firmness and stability to it, in order that it may be enabled, if need be, to stand without any extraneous support. Gentlemen, the law clerks, I believe, from a long experience in the profession, are entitled to our warmest sympathy. The faithfulness with which they perform the duties which are entrusted to them, has won for them the respect of their employers, and the admiration of those with whom they are brought into contact. In the profession of the law there are some great prizes which can be obtained only by the few, but from the ranks of solicitors and of barristers, eminent men have been produced, and many instances might be mentioned of their attaining the highest rank in the profession of the law. But those examples are few compared with the hundreds and thousands of clerks who are doomed to a life in which one of the most important duties is to make provision for the future; and in this way the Law Clerks' Society specially recommends itself as a means of inducing habits of providence and giving security against absolute want. I trust, therefore, that your numbers will increase, and that each succeeding year you will have a large addition to the subscriptions of the mem-

bers themselves, as being the surest source of prosperity to the institution. But for years past the society has been fortunate in securing the assistance of those beyond its members. Many have taken a deep interest in its affairs, and even these anniversary meetings possess the great advantage of bringing together the different branches of the profession. You have the clerks, for whose benefit we associate together; you have the employers, whether they be solicitors or barristers, or judges, who are, indeed, anxious to promote so valuable an institution. Meetings of this description promote harmony and goodwill in the profession, binding all its members together in one common interest, which, I am thankful to say, results in benefit to the law clerks, and, as a consequence, in advantage to the whole profession. I am happy to have been here this evening, and I trust that our meeting together will prove to be as successful as former gatherings; and I shall propose to you that which every one here must have at heart, "Prosperity to the United Law Clerks' Society," because we wish well to the members of the society, and desire to aid them in their work of benevolence and philanthropy.

Mr. FORSYTH, Q.C., in proposing, "The Lord Chancellor, and the other patrons of the society," informed the assembly that on the last occasion of his being present at a similar gathering he had proposed the health of Lord Campbell, as Chancellor, and expressed a hope that it would be long ere they lost the present Lord Chancellor by death. Nothing but praise could be uttered as regarded Lord Hatherley, and of all the illustrious men who had distinguished themselves by the gifts of intellect or knowledge of the law there was no man more respected and beloved than the present Lord Chancellor. He did not know that any title or dignity which Lord Hatherley had attained redounded more to his honour, than that of the Lay Bishop of Westminster, which had been accorded to him in consequence of his benevolence and religious zeal. He would remind his hearers that the honour of their great profession was to a large extent in the hands of the law clerks, and he was glad to find that they were, year by year, more and more determined to prove themselves, not only lawyers, but gentlemen and Christians of the day. He hoped, as long as the profession of the law existed, and such anniversaries were held, the Lord Chancellor would be numbered amongst its patrons.

Mr. JOSHUA WILLIAMS, Q.C., responded, saying, that the mottoes of the society were "Good will to men," and "Visit the widows and the fatherless."

Mr. HARRY G. ROGERS then read a list of subscriptions and donations, including twenty guineas from the Chairman, and like amounts from Vice-Chancellor James and Messrs. Linklater.

Mr. BARON PIGOTT proposed "The Chairman," whose advancement he ascribed to a determination to do with all his might that which his Lordship felt it right to do. He added that before he (Baron Pigott) became a judge, he knew comparatively little of law clerks; but during the last five years he had had great experience of them, and he would not omit the opportunity of expressing his gratitude to them for the mode in which they conducted business at the chambers of the judges; and for the intelligence they manifested, and the deference they paid to the office of the judge. He felt it a duty to say so much of the law clerks with whom he had become acquainted. If he knew an instance, it was but a solitary exception, of anything approaching chicanery, or taking unfair advantage and as long as the conduct of the law clerks continued to be what he believed it was, there never would be wanting a Lord Chief Justice, or some high dignitary of the law, to take the chair at the anniversaries of the society.

The CHAIRMAN, in response, said the one advantage of attaining to his present position was that it gave him better opportunity to further the interests of such institutions as the United Law Clerks Society. He was sorry to find that there were few outside the profession who were contributors to the society funds, and would venture to make a suggestion for the attention of the governing body. He asked them to consider whether, as an inducement to those who entered the profession at small salaries to join the society, a graduated scale might not be adopted by means of which the younger members would be placed upon a footing of proportionate advantage with the older members; and if his suggestion were thought worthy of adoption he should be happy to furnish a letter of introduction to Mr. Tidd Pratt.

At this juncture the Chairman begged to be permitted to vacate the chair, which he did, and his position was filled by Mr. Forsyth, Q.C.

Mr. PRIDEAUX, Q.C., in a business-like speech proposed "The Bench, the Bar, and the Profession," which was neatly responded to by Mr. Maynard, in the unavoidable absence of Mr. Gregory, M.P., who had left the meeting in order to attend to his Parliamentary duties.

Mr. MORGAN HOWARD proposed "The Trustees," which was responded to by Mr. Bircham.

Mr. MELLOR proposed "The Honorary Stewards," to which Mr. Horace Lloyd, Q.C., responded, and the guests shortly afterwards departed.

LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.

At the meeting of this society, held on Tuesday evening last, at the Law Institution, Chancery-lane, the secretary announced the call to the Bar of Mr. William Hodson Lloyd, a member of this society, and who formerly filled the office of secretary.

THE BANKRUPTCY BILL.

The following is a petition to the House of Commons, by the Metropolitan and Provincial Law Association, to be presented by Mr. G. O. Morgan, M.P.:—

The humble petition of the Metropolitan and Provincial Law Association.

Sheweth,—That your petitioners fully recognise the justice and the desirability of administering bankruptcy on the basis of allowing creditors (who in most cases are alone interested in the realisation of the assets) to have that administration left in their own hands unfettered, so far as is compatible with justice to the bankrupt, and the necessity of avoiding abuse by those in whom the power is delegated, and your petitioners therefore desire to testify their approval of so much of the bill now before your honourable House as proposes to reduce official routine and restraint, and hand over the administration of the bankrupt's estate to the creditors and those named by them. But your petitioners are nevertheless of opinion that in carrying out these views the framers of the present bill have fallen into serious errors to which your petitioners will hereafter call attention.

But before adverting to the proposed enactments touching the administration of bankruptcy, your petitioners would desire to express their views on that most vital and important part of the proposed bill which relates to the proposed constitution of the Court of Bankruptcy, and representing as your petitioners do a large body of practising solicitors, they believe that they are above all other classes able to bring a large amount of experience and practical knowledge to bear on this subject.

Your petitioners believe that the proposed plan of placing the whole of the London district under the sole jurisdiction of one chief judge of the Common Law Courts, who is also to be the appellate judge in bankruptcy from all the county courts, is open to most serious objections.

In administering so large and important an amount of business as is transacted in the London district, it is absolutely essential that there should be a constant, ready, and summary access to the judge to decide questions constantly arising on adjudications, on examinations, on proofs of debt, and otherwise at meetings, and which questions are readily determined under the present constitution of the court, by an immediate adjournment to the commissioner without counsel and without expense or delay, but such ready access would be incompatible with the duties and dignity of a chief judge sitting as an appellate judge.

Again it would be inconsistent if on the one hand in the country districts, embracing as they do large centres of commerce, and in which bankruptcies of a most important character occur, the business of such bankruptcies were to be conducted by attorneys before county court judges, whilst on the other hand in London a large amount of precisely similar business, necessarily in a large proportion of cases of a most important character, could only be transacted through the medium of counsel and before an appellate judge; such employment of counsel involving in every instance the expense of preparation of briefs and fees to counsel, in addition to the fees for the solicitor's attendance.

Your petitioners believe that the constitution of the

Court of Bankruptcy that would be best suited to the administration of that peculiar class of business and to the interests of the commercial community would be best obtained if each one of the three present very able commissioners (and on the death or resignation of one, then two) were to sit separately and exercise all original jurisdiction in the London district, which would certainly furnish an amount of business sufficient to occupy the time of two commissioners. And that the three commissioners or any two of them should form an appellate court to hear appeals as well from the decisions of any single London commissioner as from the decisions of the county courts.

And in order that all appeals may be speedy and economical, your petitioners attach great importance (in the interests of the public, and certainly not of themselves) to the necessity of providing (whatever may be the constitution of the Court) that solicitors may be entitled to appear and plead both in court and in chambers, and that it should not be necessary to employ counsel. This practice has existed in the Court of Bankruptcy from time immemorial. It was specially enacted in Lord Brougham's Act, establishing the Court of Bankruptcy in 1831, by the Bankruptcy Law Consolidation Act, 1849; by the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Bill, in 1859; and by the Bankruptcy Act, 1861. It should be understood that the questions arising in bankruptcy are ordinarily of a most practical character involving questions of account or otherwise of a character with which solicitors are familiar, they have generally been previously argued by the solicitors before the registrar or commissioner in chambers, and moreover they ultimately involve commonly a dividend of most uncertain amount, and the expenses attendant upon the discussion of them on one side at least are to be borne either by the creditor who has made a bad debt or by a bankrupt who has no funds, and in either case it is most essential that the least possible expense should be incurred.

Your petitioners desire to express their approval of the provisions introduced into the present bill for enabling secured creditors to have their securities valued, and so prove for the deficiency, a measure which was introduced as regards deeds of arrangement with good effect into the Bankruptcy Amendment Act, 1868, and remedied an evil which was very much felt before. But your petitioners would call attention to the fact that by section 15 sub-section 5 of the present bill a "secured creditor" is erroneously described as any creditor holding security of a third person which would include creditors on bills of exchange or creditors holding security from a third person or guarantees (none of them subjects of valuation) which could not be intended by the framers of the bill.

Your petitioners would also point out that the bill proposes that the value of the security shall be determined by the trustee in order to enable a creditor to vote in the choice of such trustee, which is an impossibility, and your petitioners would suggest that until the choice of a trustee the value shall be determined by the registrar and after the choice of trustee by the trustee subject to the revision of the Court.

Your petitioners would point out that a special resolution (that is to say a resolution at a meeting of creditors called for a specific object) is made necessary for matters not of sufficient importance to justify such an expense. As for example, by section 26 the trustee could not compromise a debt of £5 either with a debtor or creditor of the estate without calling a special meeting.

Your petitioners are also of opinion that in a very large number of bankruptcies it will be as it constantly is sufficiently difficult to get any trustee to act, but it will in a great number of cases (probably a majority) be quite impracticable to get any creditors to act as a committee of inspection. And your petitioners are of opinion that it would lead to much more beneficial results in facilitating the realisation of an estate on the one hand, and the prevention of abuse on the other, if such restrictions as it is thought necessary to impose upon trustees should be imposed by making it necessary to obtain the leave of the Court in all important matters, and giving the Court authority, where it shall think fit, to take the opinion of the creditors by directing a meeting to be called.

Your petitioners would also express their opinion, founded on actual practical experience, that there is the greatest difficulty in a large number of cases in getting any respectable and eligible creditor to take upon himself the office of assignee, and if it be made necessary that persons taking

the office of trustee should give security the effect would be very prejudicial, as in many cases it would exclude the most fit persons from accepting the office.

Your petitioners would suggest, with regard to acts of bankruptcy, that it is most important, as regards traders in particular, that keeping out of the way, absconding, shutting up the place of business, and non-compliance with trader debtor summons should be retained as acts of bankruptcy, and that as regards non-traders as well as traders the seizure and sale of goods under an execution should be an act of bankruptcy. And your petitioners particularly suggest that it is most desirable to retain the act of bankruptcy by filing a declaration of insolvency, as it is very important to have a ready means of obtaining a voluntary act of bankruptcy, both for the purpose, if necessary, of securing on emergencies an equal distribution of the bankrupt's property amongst his creditors, and also for securing his good faith when bankruptcy is delayed by his creditors for the purpose of investigation or for giving a trader an opportunity of making other arrangements with his creditors.

Your petitioners would point out that the expression "trader" in the present bill is much too limited in its definition. For example it would not include a banker, an underwriter, and many other persons now subject to the bankrupt laws, and they would suggest that the definitions heretofore in use in the Bankruptcy Acts by means of special enumerations of certain specified callings should be repeated.

Your petitioners would point out that the proceeding provided in section 6 sub-section 4 to make a debtor bankrupt for non-payment of a debt within seven days would be impracticable for want of certainty as to the amount of the debt being owing, or the sufficiency of the security offered by the debtor. Your petitioners would suggest that the law and practice at present in force in these respects is wanting in none of these important details, is thoroughly understood, and works well and should be retained.

Your petitioners are of opinion that sections 110 and 136 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1861, which enable creditors by resolution to take an estate out of bankruptcy after adjudication, and to realize and administer it in such manner as may be determined upon by the creditors, but reserving under section 136 the power of going to the Court upon any points of difference arising in the administration of the estate, have been largely resorted to, and have proved to be most valuable and beneficial, and they would urge the importance of introducing provisions of a similar character into the present bill.

That your petitioners believe that the provisions made for liquidation by arrangement in the proposed bill are in no respect so well adapted for that object as the provisions contained in the 192nd section, and the following section of the Bankruptcy Act, 1861, as amended by the Bankruptcy Amendment Act, 1868. The effect of those Acts has now been construed at great expense to the public by a large number of decisions of the Courts of Common Law and Bankruptcy, they are thoroughly understood, and fraud is effectually prevented by the Act of last session. Your petitioners are therefore of opinion that much mischief would result from repealing these provisions, and in particular your petitioners believe that composition deeds when guarded from abuse as they now are by the Act passed last session, are really beneficial to creditors, as they in many cases enable them to get a better dividend than they would get under a bankruptcy, as the debtor's friends are frequently induced to assist him in the payment of a larger composition than the estate would produce under a bankruptcy if the result is to be that his business is not to be broken up. But apart from the reasons above stated for retaining the law as it at present stands in respect to deeds of arrangement, your petitioners would point out that the provisions proposed by the present bill would not be found practicable in their present form, for in it is proposed that the debtor shall assign all his estate to trustees without getting any immediate discharge or other certain advantage in return, but that he should trust for any discharge to the resolution of a meeting of his creditors "at such time, and in such manner, and upon such terms and conditions as the creditors think fit," and as in the meantime there is no stay of actions there could be no inducement to any debtor to resort to this mode of liquidation. Your petitioners would, moreover, observe that as the trustee is not to have the power of disclaiming onerous leases, contracts, or shares, no creditor could be advised to act as trustee.

That your petitioners consider the clauses of the present bill with regard to after-acquired property very harsh upon the bankrupt, and really destructive of their object. They would suggest that any provisions for making after-acquired property of bankrupts liable for the debts under the bankruptcy should be made subject in the first instance to after-incurred debts, and in the next place that they should only operate for the general benefit of all the creditors under the bankruptcy, and not for the benefit of individual creditors as proposed by this bill. They consider, in fact, that it is contrary to sound policy, and to the express enactments of the law of bankruptcy up to this time, and tending to increase extortion and unfair conduct, to enable any creditor to obtain an individual advantage after bankruptcy; and they would point out that the proposed bill is open to this objection in respect to the right given to creditors to enforce the unpaid portions of their claims against the bankrupt five years after the bankruptcy by section 49, and as regards the authority to the bankrupt to purchase the debt of and stand in the shoes of his own creditor by the same section.

Your petitioners consider that great inconvenience would result from the proposed provision that the accounts in all bankruptcies (whether in London or in the country) should be audited by the comptroller in London only, and they believe that it would be impossible for one officer in London, however ably assisted, to get through such an amount of work, and that most serious delay and an inefficient performance of the duty would be the result, and they would recommend that in cases in the county courts the registrar should act as comptroller except where he himself holds the office of trustee.

That your petitioners observe that by section 10 it is proposed to abolish the title by relation back of the trustee (although from the language of section 91 this is not quite clear), your petitioners believe that the title by relation back is often productive of evil, and certainly to a great extent is founded upon a fiction of law, and your petitioners are of opinion that it would be better that it should be abolished. But in such case it will be important that very considerable additions should be made to the powers of assignees to set aside fraudulent conveyances, fraudulent preferences, and all other fraudulent transactions made within a limited time of the bankruptcy.

Your petitioners, therefore, humbly pray that your honourable House will be pleased to amend the said bill "to consolidate and amend the law of bankruptcy" in the foregoing respects, and that the said bill when so amended may pass your honourable House and become law.

And your petitioners will ever pray.

EDWARD LAWRENCE, Chairman.
PHILIP RICKMAN, Secretary.

LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL.

CANDIDATES WHO PASSED THE FINAL EXAMINATION.

Easter Term, 1869.

Name of Candidate.	To whom Articled, Assigned, &c.
Almond, Edwin	Robert Bennett.
Badham, Harry Alexander	George Badham.
Beedham, Thomas Claughton	Robert E. Pannett; B. H. Beedham.
Berkeley, Comyns William	Comyns Rowland Berkeley.
Lateward	Frederick Blake.
Blake, Walter Scott	Dyne & Harvey.
Bolton, Thomas Henry	William John Woolley.
Bosworth, Henry Wright	Edward Elwin.
Carder, Eugene	Henry Thompson.
Castle, Spencer	
Chamberlain, Reginald	
Storer	H. James Davis; H. A. Owston.
Chambers, James	John Watson.
Collins, Alexander	Edward K. Bridger.
Cooper, Frederick Bernard	Samuel Herbert Cooper.
Craig, Charles James	Alexander Samuel Craig.
Darlington, John Shaw	Ralph Darlington.
Davies, Samuel Richard	John Cooke.
De Fivas, Alan Stevenson	Francis Truett.
Dupree, Theodore	Joseph James Maberly.
Edwards, Thomas	Thomas Kersey Edwards.

Names of Candidates.

Evans, John Albert Griffith	To whom Articled, Assigned, &c. Asa J. Evans; Charles E. Abbott; William Evans George.
Farmer, Charles Edward	Henry Thomas Young.
Fleming, Albert	James Heather.
Fryer, Robert Hoskins	Henry Hooper Fryer.
Galloway, William Charles	John Moxon Clabon.
Garbutt, Charles James	John Alderton Bush.
Gard, William Snowdon, jun.	James Townley.
Graves, John	Robert Broatch.
Griffin, Herbert John	George Whitcombe.
Hall, Samuel Alfred	William Skilbeck.
Hunt, Alfred	Benjamin Hunt.
Hutchinson, Edward	Robert R. Dees; Arthur Lucas.
L'Anson, Philip Blakeway	Henry Shepherd Law.
Jeffery, Herbert James	John Rust Jeffery.
Jennings, George Joseph	John Weston Morris.
Jones, Morris Paterson	Morris Charles Jones.
Jones, William Charles	Herbert Walter Nelson.
Kewney, Stanley	George Kewney.
King, George Hall	John Cosens Parnell.
Langworthy, William Frederick	James Roger Bramble.
Lind, Charles Henry	John Guscotte.
Manby, George Frederick	William Manby.
Masters, Samuel Wheatley	Alexander Forbes Tweedie.
Mirams, Edward	John Henry Kays.
Moore, James Lord	Francis Marriott.
Morgan, William	George Kenrick.
Mote, John Hurden	John Michael Morris.
Morris, William	George Hollings; O. A. Ulithorne.
Parker, John Thomas	Leonard John Deacon.
Payne, Frederick Fitz	F. Andrew Payne.
Pyke, Edward George	F. Sumner Irving.
Raven, John	Charles Kendall; G. M. Wetherfield; B. Norton.
Rawlings, Edward Bailey	Cornelius Thomas Saunders.
Reed, Henry	Albert Besant.
Saunders, Albert	Henry Graham Stokes.
Shipman, John Greenwood	Robert Metcalfe.
Smith, Middleton	Matthew Gray.
Tebbs, Henry	James Peter Piper.
Watkins, Thomas William	William Plummer.
Wicks, Henry Philip	James Brockbank.
Williams, Arthur	William Hunt.
Wilson, Robert Bolton	John Bolton.
Winship, Lionel William	Thos. William Keenleyside.
Winterbotham, William	
Howard, B.A.	Lindsey W. Winterbotham; T. Waterhouse, LL.B.
Woodall, William, jun.	Francis Leach.

CALLS TO THE BAR.—April 30.

Middle Temple:—Thomas Tomlinson, B.A., Dublin; James Colquhoun Revell Reade, Oxford; William Turley Mainprize, London; Charles Archibald Samuells, Frederic Taylor Payne, LL.B., Cambridge; Hon. George Thomas Kenyon, B.A., Oxford; W. H. Lloyd, Francis Broxholm Grey Jenkinson, Aubrey St. John Clerke, B.A., Dublin; Francis Thorne Cole, Charles Haigh, Arthur Pawson, John Paddon Latimer, and Charles Woodin Law, Bachelor es Sciences, Esqrs.

Inner Temple:—John Tankerville Goldney, B.A., LL.B., Cambridge; Frederic Green, M.A., London; Edward Charles Russell Ross, B.A., Cambridge; William Francis Shaw, B.A., Cambridge; Robert Collier, LL.B., Cambridge; Edward William Foss, B.A., Oxford; George James Duncan, B.A., Cambridge; Uthred James Hay Dunbar, B.A., Oxford; Nathaniel Albert Hunt, B.A., Cambridge; William Russell Griffiths, LL.B., Cambridge; Philip Vernon Smith, B.A., Cambridge; Oliver Augustus Saunders, Cambridge; and Walter Lacy Rogers, M.A., Oxford, Esqrs.

Lincoln's-inn:—Charles Fuhr Jemmett, LL.B., B.A., Cambridge, and B.C.L., Oxford; William George Gould, late of Oxford; Stephen James Taylor, George De Butts, B.A., Dublin; Reginald Braunfield, Oxford; Robert Hill Pinhey, and William Henry Craig, M.A., Dublin, Esqrs.

Gray's-inn:—Henry Keeble, Esq.

COURT PAPERS.

COURT OF CHANCERY.

VACATION NOTICE.

During the Whitsun Vacation all applications necessary to be made at the equity judge's chambers are to be made at the chambers of the Master of the Rolls.

The chambers of the Master of the Rolls will be open on the 11th, 12th, 13th, 14th, 18th, 19th, and 20th days of May, 1869, from 11 to 1.

SITTINGS IN TRINITY TERM, 1869.

LORD CHANCELLOR.

Lincoln's Inn.

Satur., May 22.. App. mtns. & apps.
 Monday 24.. Petns. & Apps.
 Tuesday 25 } Appeals.
 Wednesday 26 }
 Thursday .. 27.. App. mtns. & apps.
 Friday 28 }
 Saturday .. 29 } Appeals.
 Monday 31 }
 Tues., June 1 }
 Wednesday .. 2 { No sitting—Her
 Mjsty's Btdy.kpt.
 Thursday .. 3.. App. mtns. & apps.
 Friday 4 }
 Saturday .. 5 } Appeals.
 Monday 7 }
 Tuesday 8 }
 Wednesday .. 9 }
 Thursday .. 10 }
 Friday 11.. Petitions and apps.
 Saturday .. 12.. App.mtns. & apps.

N.B.—Such days as his Lordship shall be engaged in the House of Lords are excepted.

MASTER OF THE ROLLS.

Chancery-lane.

Satur., May 22.. Mtns. & gen. pa.
 Monday 24 } General paper.
 Tuesday 25 }
 Wednesday 26 }
 Thursday .. 27.. Mtns. & gen. pa.
 Friday 28 }
 Saturday .. 29 } Petns. sht. caus.,
 adj. sums., and
 general paper.
 Monday 31 } General paper.
 Tues., June 1 }
 Wednesday .. 2 { No sitting—Her
 Mjsty's Btdy.kpt.
 Thursday .. 3.. Mtns. & gen. papr.
 Friday 4.. General paper.
 Saturday .. 5 } Petns. sht. caus.,
 adj. sums., and
 general paper.
 Monday 7 }
 Tuesday 8 } General paper.
 Wednesday .. 9 }
 Thursday .. 10 }
 Friday 11 } Petns. sht. caus.,
 adj. sums., and
 general paper.

Satur., May 22.. Mtns. & gen. pa.
 Monday 24 } General paper.
 Tuesday 25 }
 Wednesday 26 }
 Thursday .. 27.. Mtns. & gen. pa.
 Friday 28 }
 Saturday .. 29 } Petns. sht. caus.,
 adj. sums., and
 general paper.

N.B.—Unopposed petitions must be presented and copies left with the Secretary, on or before the Thursday preceding the Saturday on which it is intended they should be heard; and any causes intended to be heard as short causes must be so marked at least one clear day before the same can be put in the paper to be so heard.

LORDS JUSTICES.

Lincoln's Inn.

Satur., May 22.. App.mtns. & apps.
 Monday 24 } Appeals.
 Tuesday 25 }
 Wednesday 26 }
 Thursday .. 27 }
 Friday 28 } Petns. in lunacy,
 app. ptns., bk.
 apps. app. mtns.,
 & appeals.
 Saturday 29 } Appeals.
 Monday 31 }
 Tues., June 1 } Apps. from the
 County Palatine of
 Lancaster & App.
 Wednesday .. 2 { No sitting—Her
 Mjsty's Btdy.kpt.
 Thursday .. 3.. Appeals.
 Friday 4 } Petns. in lunacy,
 app. ptns., bk.
 apps. app. mtns.
 & apps.

Saturday .. 5 }
 Monday 7 }
 Tuesday 8 } Appeals.
 Wednesday .. 9 }
 Thursday .. 10 }
 Friday 11 } Petns. in lunacy,
 app. ptns., bk.
 apps. & appeals.
 Saturday .. 12.. App. mtns. & apps.

NOTICE.—The days (if any) on which the Lords Justices shall be engaged in the Full Court, or at the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, are excepted.

V. C. SIR JOHN STUART.

Lincoln's Inn.

Satur., May 22.. Motions & causes.
 Monday 24 }
 Tuesday 25 } Causes.
 Wednesday 26 }
 Thursday .. 27.. Mtns. & causes.
 Friday 28.. Petns. and causes.
 Saturday .. 29.. Sht. causes & caus.
 Monday 31 } Causes.
 Tues., June 1 }
 Wednesday .. 2 { No sitting—Her
 Mjsty's Btdy.kpt.
 Thursday .. 3.. Mtns. & causes.
 Friday 4.. Petns. and causes.
 Saturday .. 5.. Sht. causes & caus.
 Monday 7 }
 Tuesday 8 } Causes.
 Wednesday .. 9 }
 Thursday .. 10 }
 Friday 11 } Petns. sht. caus.,
 & causes.
 Saturday .. 12.. Motions.

N.B.—Any causes intended to be heard as short causes must be so marked at least one clear day before the same can be put in the paper to be so heard.
 No cause, motion for decree, or further consideration, except by order of the Court, may be marked to stand over, if it shall be within twelve of the last cause or matter in the printed paper of the day for hearing.

V. C. SIR RICHARD MALINS.

Lincoln's Inn.

Satur., May 22.. Mtns. & gen. pa.
 Monday 24 } General paper.
 Tuesday 25 }
 Wednesday 26 }
 Thursday .. 27.. Mtns. & gen. pa.
 Friday 28.. Petns. & gen. pa.
 Saturday .. 29 } Sht. causes, adj.
 sums., & gen. pa.
 Monday 31 } General paper.
 Tues., June 1 }
 Wednesday .. 2 { No sitting—Her
 Mjsty's Btdy.kpt.
 Thursday .. 3.. Mtns. & gen. pa.
 Friday 4.. Petns. & gen. pa.
 Saturday .. 5 } Short causes adj.
 sums., & gen. pa.
 Monday 7 }
 Tuesday 8 } General paper.
 Wednesday .. 9 }
 Thursday .. 10 }
 Friday 11 } Petns. sht. caus.,
 adj. sums., and
 general paper.

Satur., May 22.. Mtns. & gen. pa.
 Monday 24 } General paper.
 Tuesday 25 }
 Wednesday 26 }
 Thursday .. 27.. Mtns. & gen. pa.
 Friday 28.. Petns. & gen. pa.
 Saturday .. 29 } Sht. causes, adj.
 sums., & gen. pa.

N.B.—Any causes intended to be heard as short causes must be so marked at least one clear day before the same can be put in the paper to be so heard.

V. C. SIR W. M. JAMES.

Lincoln's Inn.

Satur., May 22.. Mtns. & gen. pa.
 Monday 24 } General paper.
 Tuesday 25 }
 Wednesday 26 }
 Thursday .. 27.. Mtns. & gen. pa.
 Friday 28.. Petns. & gen. pa.
 Saturday .. 29 } Sht. causes, adj.
 sums., & gen. pa.

Thursday .. 27.. Mtns. & gen. pa.
 Friday 28.. General paper.
 Saturday .. 29 } Petns. sht. caus.,
 adj. sums., & gen. pa.
 Monday 31 } General paper.
 Tuesday 1 }
 Wednesday .. 2 { No sitting—Her
 Mjsty's Btdy.kpt.
 Thursday .. 3.. Mtns. & gen. pa.
 Friday 4.. General paper.
 Saturday .. 5 } Petns. sht. caus.,
 adj. sums., and
 general paper.
 Monday 7 }
 Tuesday 8 } General paper.
 Wednesday .. 9 }
 Thursday .. 10 } Petns. sht. caus.,
 adj. sums., and
 general paper.
 Friday 11 }
 Saturday .. 12.. Mtns. & gen. pa.

THE CASES standing in the new trial paper tried before the Lord Chief Justice and the Hon. Mr. Justice Mellor remaining undisposed of at the end of the term will be taken at the Sittings in Banc after term, commencing on Monday, the 10th instant.

QUEEN'S BENCH.

COMMON PLEAS.

Sittings at Nisi Prius in Middlesex and London, before the Right Hon. Sir WILLIAM BOVILL, Knt., Lord Chief Justice of her Majesty's Court of Common Pleas, at Westminster, in and after Trinity Term, 1869.

IN TERM.

Middlesex.

Monday May 24 | Friday June 4
 Monday " 31 |

The Court will not sit in London during term.

AFTER TERM.

Middlesex. London.
 Monday June 14 | Friday June 25
 Monday " 31 |

During this term the Court will sit at Nisi Prius on Mondays at half-past 10 o'clock, and on all other days at 10 o'clock.

EXCHEQUER OF PLEAS.

Sittings at Nisi Prius in Middlesex and London, before the Right Hon. Sir FRITZ ROY KELLY, Knt., Lord Chief Baron of her Majesty's Court of Exchequer, in and after Trinity Term, 1869.

IN TERM.

Middlesex.

Monday May 24 | Monday June 7
 Monday " 31 |

The Court will not sit in London during term.

AFTER TERM.

Middlesex. London.
 Monday June 14 | Monday June 28
 Monday " 31 |

The Court will sit in Middlesex, in term, by adjournment from day to day until the causes entered for the respective Middlesex sittings are disposed of.

During this Term the Court will sit at Nisi Prius on Mondays at half-past 10 o'clock, and on all other days at 10 o'clock.

INDEXING AND DIGESTING.—Owing to the present tendencies of the Legislature thoroughly to assimilate the law and practice of the two countries, the Irish reports will become still more valuable in future than they were hitherto. Owing to the prevalence of absenteeism, a very considerable portion of Irish conveyancing is, we believe, transacted in London. But with regard to equity *pur et simple* the Irish reports, we believe, usually contain as profound and elaborate judgments as are to be found in our own.—*Law Magazine*.

In the Irish Court of Chancery, in Dublin, on the 1st of May, Mr. Heron, Q.C., applied on behalf of Mr. Orcott, an English solicitor, that he be appointed a Commissioner Extraordinary for taking affidavits at Manchester, where his father had filled a similar office for many years. The Lord Chancellor appointed Messrs. Grundy & Nuttall, and observed that it was against Mr. Heron's client (Mr. Orcott) that his father filled the same situation. Nothing could be more mischievous than the idea of vested rights from father to son in such matters.

We have received from Messrs. Jenner & Knewstubb a specimen of their "A B C Despatch Box." It is a neat and useful receptacle, and possesses an especial convenience from the ingenious contrivance for sorting and separating the contents alphabetically by means of shifting flaps furnished with a ledger-index. We should suggest, by the way, that this box would be still more handy if made conveniently portable by the addition of a handle.

PUBLIC COMPANIES.

LAST QUOTATION, May 7, 1869.

[From the Official List of the actual business transacted.]

GOVERNMENT FUNDS.

3 per Cent. Consols, 93	Annuities, April, '85, 11 15-16
Ditto for Account, June 1, 91½	Do. (Red Sea T.) Aug. 1908
5 per Cent. Reduced 91½	Ex Bills, £1000, 2 per Ct. p m
New 3 per Cent., 91½	Ditto, £500, Do 2 p m
Do. 3½ per Cent., Jan. '94	Ditto, £100 & £200, 2 p m
Do. 2½ per Cent., Jan. '94 76	Bank of England Stock, 4½ per
Do. 5 per Cent., Jan. '73	Ct. (last half-year)
Annuities, Jan. '80—	Ditto for Account, 242

INDIAN GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

India Stk., 10½ p Ct. Apr. '74, 211	Ind. Enf. Fr., 3 p Ct., Jan. '72 105½
Ditto for Account	Ditto, 5½ per Cent., May, '73 110½
Ditto 5 per Cent., July, '80 114½	Ditto Debentures, per Cent.,
Ditto for Account,—	April, '64—
Ditto 4 per Cent., Oct. '88 100½	Do. Do., 5 per Cent., Aug. '73 103½
Ditto, ditto, Certificates,—	Do. Bonds, 4 per Ct., £1000 8 p m
Ditto Enfaced Ppr., 4 per Cent.	Ditto, ditto, under £1000, 8 p m

RAILWAY STOCK.

Shres.	Railways.	Paid.	Closing prices
Stock	Bristol and Exeter	100	78
Stock	Caledonian	100	78
Stock	Glasgow and South-Western	100	97
Stock	Great Eastern Ordinary Stock	100	37½
Stock	Do., East Anglian Stock, No. 2	100	—
Stock	Great Northern	100	106½
Stock	Do., A Stock*	100	107½
Stock	Great Southern and Western of Ireland	100	97
Stock	Great Western—Original	100	48½
Stock	Do., West Midland—Oxford	100	27
Stock	Do., do.—Newport	100	30
Stock	Lancashire and Yorkshire	100	129½
Stock	London, Brighton, and South Coast	100	17½
Stock	London, Chatham, and Dover	100	47½
Stock	London and North-Western	100	118½
Stock	London and South-Western	100	88
Stock	Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln	100	52½
Stock	Metropolitan	100	102
Stock	Midland	100	112½
Stock	Do., Birmingham and Derby	100	80
Stock	North British	100	34½
Stock	North London	100	121
Stock	North Staffordshire	100	56
Stock	South Devon	100	43
Stock	South-Eastern	100	75½
Stock	Taff Vale	100	150

* A receives no dividend until 6 per cent. has been paid to B.

MONEY MARKET AND CITY INTELLIGENCE.

The realizations occasioned by the late rise in the funds brought about, at the beginning of this week, an unmistakable decline. The other markets sympathise. Railways have been especially heavy. To-day the Bank directors raised their discount rate from 4 per cent. (April 1st) to 4½ per cent. An enormous amount of money has been constantly invested of late in United States Securities, the result being an inflation there and a depression here; and unless the higher terms named by the Bank suffice to divert the stream at present finding its way to America the Bank rate will ascend yet higher. The advance produced much heaviness in the railway market. The London, Chatham, and Dover Railway Company's Bill, under which everything is to be referred to the arbitration of Lord Cairns and Lord Salisbury, passed the Commons early in the week. A fall has taken place in the Metropolitan Company's stock, in consequence of reports adverse to the success of their bill. A somewhat notable controversy has arisen between the Caledonian and North British Companies, respecting their joint purse arrangement. There has been almost an entire absence of gold transactions at the Bank.

Mr. T. C. Litch, Town Clerk of the borough of Tynemouth, which office he has held since its incorporation in 1849, has sent in his resignation to the Town Council.

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS.

KENT—On May 1, at Norwich, the wife of Alfred Kent, Esq., Solicitor, of a daughter.

ROBERTS—On May 4, at Brynderw, Surbiton, Surrey, the wife of Richard W. Roberts, Esq., of Gray's Inn, of a son.

DEATHS.

BEECHAM—On May 5, at 8, Magdalen-road, St. Leonard's-on-Sea, William Payne Beecham, Esq., Solicitor, late of Hawkhurst, aged 70.

CRICK—On April 26, at his residence, Maldon, John Crick, Esq., Solicitor, aged 60.

DEVONSHIRE—On April 29, at Holford square, Pentonville, Mr. Thomas Harris Devonshire, for nearly 50 years the highly esteemed and confidential Clerk of Messrs. Freshfields, of Bank-buildings, in his 78th year.

LEWIS—On May 5, Harriet, the wife of James Graham Lewis, Esq., of 53, Euston-square, and 10, Ely-place, in the 65th year of her age.

NEWSTEAD—On May 3, at 18, Ely-place, Holborn, William Henry Newstead, Esq., Solicitor, aged 60.

ESTATE EXCHANGE REPORT.

AT THE MART.

May 4.—By Messrs. CHINNOCK, GALSORTHY, & CHINNOCK.

Leasehold, 2 residences, Nos. 5, Harley street, and 2, Wignore street, Cavendish square, producing £412 per annum; term, 50 years from 1854, at £135 per annum—Sold for £3,300.
Leasehold, 4 shops and 5 houses, Nos. 26 to 35, Artillery row, Westminster, producing £430 per annum; term, 37 years from 1868, at £2 per annum—Sold for £3,820.
Leasehold house, No. 18, Duke street, also No. 28, Thomas street, Oxford street, producing £370 per annum; term, 11 years unexpired, at £136 10s. per annum—Sold for £1,050.
Freehold ground rent of £16 per annum, arising from Nos. 73 and 75, Princes road, Notting hill, and 1, St. John's place adjoining—Sold for £250.

May 6.—By Messrs. WALLIN & CLUNN.

Freehold, 13a or 34p of building land, situate at Tottenham—Sold for £3,260.

Freehold, 15a 3r 26p of meadow land, with farmyard, buildings, &c., situate as above—Sold for £2,780.

Freehold estate, comprising the house and homestead of Whalebone Farm, with gardens, orchard, and two pieces of land adjoining, containing 8a or 34p, situate at Dagenham, Essex—Sold for £1,480.

Freehold, 7a or 19p of land, situate as above—Sold for £1,100.

Freehold, 38a 2r 32p of land, situate as above—Sold for £3,500.

Freehold, 7a 3r 17p of land, situate as above—Sold for £570.

By Messrs. BUTCHER.

Copyhold 30a of land and three cottages, situated at Banstead, Surrey; and a freehold plot of land at Ewell. Sold for £3,300.

By Messrs. WILSON, BROTHERS.

Freehold estate, known as The Valley, comprising a residence with stabling, and meadows of about 27a 2r 13p, situate at Bromley, Kent—Sold for £7,500.

BREAKFAST.—EPPE'S COCOA.—GRATEFUL AND COMFORTING.—The very agreeable character of this preparation has rendered it a general favourite. The "Civil Service Gazette" remarks:—"The singular success which Mr. Eppe attained by his homeopathic preparation of cocoa has never been surpassed by any experimentalist. By a thorough knowledge of the natural laws which govern the operations of digestion and nutrition, and by a careful application of the fine properties of well-selected cocoa, Mr. Eppe has provided our breakfast tables with a delicately flavoured beverage which may save us many heavy doctors' bills." Made simply with boiling water or milk. Sold by the trade only in 4lb., 4lb., and 1lb. tin-lined packets, labelled—JAMES EPPE & CO., Homeopathic Chemists, London.—[ADVT.]

LONDON GAZETTES.

Winding-up of Joint Stock Companies.

FRIDAY, April 30, 1869.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Aberdare Morthyr Steam Coal Company (Limited).—Vice-Chancellor Malins has, by an order dated April 23 ordered that the above company be wound up, and that James Boatright Gibbons, the provisional official liquidator of the above company, be continued until the appointment of an official liquidator. Vining & Son, Moorgate-st-buildings, for G. B. & H. Marly, Bristol, solicitors for the petitioners.

Caldor Vegetable Silk Company (Limited).—Vice-Chancellor Malins has appointed William Fleet Smart, of 16, Bank-gate-st. official liquidator. Creditors are required, on or before May 25, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to the above. Saturday, June 5, at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

Lancaster Shipowners' Company (Limited and Reduced).—Petition for reducing the capital from £250,000 to £187,500, presented to the Chancellor of Lancaster on April 19, is now pending. The list of creditors is to be made out as for April 23. Hull & Co, Lpool, solicitors for the company.

Photogenic Gas Company (Limited).—Vice-Chancellor James has, by an order dated April 19, ordered that the voluntary winding-up of the above company be continued. Courtenay & Croome, Gracechurch-st. solicitors for the company.

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Anglo-Californian Gold Mining Company.—Vice-Chancellor Malins has, by an order dated April 19, ordered that a further call of 1s. 6d. per share be made on the contributories of the above company, excepting such as had paid the call of 3s. per share made pursuant to an order dated June 29, 1864, and that each contributory liable to make the call should, on or before May 19, pay to William Turquand, 16, Tokenhouse-yard, the amount due in respect of such call.

TUESDAY, May 4, 1869.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Portugal Railway Company (Limited).—Vice-Chancellor Malins has, by an order dated April 24, ordered that the above company be wound up, and that John Ball, of Moorgate-st, the provisional official liquidator of the above company, be continued. Mackenzie & Co, solicitors for the petitioners.

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Helston and Penryn Junction Railway Company.—Petition for winding up, presented April 22, directed to be heard before the Master of the Rolls on May 29. Bolton & Grylls-Hill, Elm-st, Temple, for Grylls-Hill & Hill, solicitors for the petitioners.

Friendly Societies Dissolved.

TUESDAY, May 4, 1869.

Amicable Friendly Society, Queen's Head Inn, Pembridge, Hereford. April 30.
Eastwick Friendly Society, School House, Eastwick, Hertford. April 30.

Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

FRIDAY, April 30, 1869.

Birdsey, Wm, Goodge-st, Tottenham Court-rd, Grocer. May 31. Willis v Birdsey, V.C. Stuart. Morton & Meadows, Bond-st, Walbrook. Brampton, Susan Anna, Worcester, Spinster. June 8. Hyde v Att-Gen., V.C. Stuart.
Bristowe, Simon, Canterbury-rd, Brixton, Barrister-at-Law. May 22. Fanshawe v Wilkins, V.C. James. Marsland, St Swithin's-lane.
Brown, Tomyns, Nelson-sq, Blackfriars-rd, Gent. May 19. Browne v Brewne, M.R. Rennolls, Lincoln's-Inn-fields.
Casselline, Thos, Hermes-st, Pentonville, Gent. May 15. Wood v Austen, V.C. Stuart. Harris, Chancery-lane.
Freeman, Edith, Long Burky, Northampton. May 22. Judkin v Allen, V.C. Malins. Britten, Northampton.
Moon, Hy, Southwood Lawn, Highgate, Gent. May 26. Moon v Moon, V.C. Malins. Rae, Mincing-lane.
Seels, Robt, Misterton, Nottingham. June 1. Gardam v Hiley, V.C. Stuart. Sharp, Epworth.
Shresbery, Jas, Potten, Bedford, Draper. June 15. Strickland v Taylor, V.C. Stuart. Rhodes & Co, Chancery-lane.
Steers, Robt, Nine Elms, Vauxhall, Esq. May 24. Steers v Silk, V.C. James. Tippetts & Son, Queen-st, Cheap-side.
Trebble, Geo, Bristol, Grocer. May 24. Trebble v Thistle, V.C. Malins. Torr & Co, Bedford-row.
Tyars, Wm Salman, Minorities, Draper. May 27. Tyars v Teanby, V.C. Malins. Earle, Bedford-row.

TUESDAY, May 4, 1869.

Brough, John, Herne Bay, Kent, Esq. May 31. Mackett v Mackett V.C. James. Yalls, Poultry.
Browne, Fredk John, Fenchurch-st, Hair Dresser. June 10. Langley v Browne, V.C. Stuart. Minet & Smith, New Broad-st.
Browne, Lydia, Anerley-rd, Norwood, Gent. June 10. Langley v Browne, V.C. Stuart. Minet & Smith, New Broad-st.
Crosley, Wm, Langford, Bedford, Farmer. May 21. Thody v Jones, V.C. James. Fox & Robinson, Gresham House, Old Broad-st.
Durnford, Wm Geo, Parliament-st, Westminster, Parliamentary Agent. May 22. Durnford v Durnford, V.C. Malins. Durrant, Guildford-st, Russell-sq.
Dyke, Hy, Charlton Kings, Gloucester, Auctioneer. May 29. Bain v Sadler, V.C. Stuart. White & Sons, Bedford-row.
Garniss, Thos, Croydon, Gent. May 26. Langton v Garniss, V.C. James. Yetts, Temple-chambers, Fleet-st.
Hartshorne, John, Ebury-st, Pimlico, Esq. May 31. Biome v Cotton, V.C. James. Mackrell, Cannon-st.
Morris, Wm, East Sheen, Mortlake, Surrey. June 10. Harris v Morris, V.C. Stuart. Janson & Co, Finsbury-circus.
Penny, Chas Wm, Shrubland-grove, Dalston, Vermin Paste Manufacturer. May 31. Penny v Penny, V.C. Malins. Beard, Basinghall-st.
Webster, Chas Fox, Princes-gardens, South Kensington. June 10. Webster v Coupland, V.C. Stuart. Young & Co, Frederick's-pl, Old Jewry.

Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim

FRIDAY, April 30, 1869.

Banks, Joseph Pierce, Hatcham-ter, New Cross, Accountant. June 1. Thompson, New Cross-rd.
Bax, Hy Bonham, Charlton, Kent, Esq. June 24. Berkeley, South-sq, Gray's-Inn.
Binyon, Alfred, Manch, Calico Printer. July 1. Aston & Co, Manch.
Boston, Hy, Bartholomew-villas, Kentish-town, Gent. June 26. Paterson & Co, Bouverie-st, Fleet-st.
Churchward, Saml, Hartfield-rd, New Wimbledon, Gent. May 31. Kearsey, Old Jewry.
Ellison, Eliza, Moss Lee, Lancashire, Spinster. July 26. Whitaker, Duchy of Lancaster Office.
Fairbairn, Geo, Ardwick, Manch, Esq. Aug 2. Harding, Manch.
Fairweather, Geo Wm, Gloucester, Iron Merchant. July 1. Bonnor, Gloucester.
Goddard, Sophia, Tottenham-et-rd, Widow. May 31. Hunter & Co, New-sq, Lincoln's-Inn.
Goodeve, Wm, Greatham, Hants, Yeoman. June 24. C & W. Trimmer, Alton.
Green, Eliz, Hertford, Widow. June 24. Spence, Hertford.
Harrison, Jas, Leamington Priors, Warwick, Esq. June 1. Fisher, Ashby-de-la-Zouch.
Harvey, Charlotte, Hereford, Widow. June 1. Humphrys & Son, Hereford.
Kludred, Frances, Clinton-rd, Mile End-rd, Spinster. June 1. Young & Sons, Mark-lane.
Lewis, Thomas, Sutton St Nicholas, Hereford, Farmer. June 1. Humphrys & Son, Hereford.
Marchant, John, jun, Hertford, Solicitor. June 30. Spence & Hawks, Hertford.
Meechem, Thos, Bristol, Horse Dealer. June 24. Boyes & Co, Plymouth.
Pearce, John Wortham, Peterborough, Surgeon. August 1. Deacon, Peterborough.
Scampton, John, Coventry, Gent. June 24. Dewes & Son, Coventry.
Stiwell, Francis Hy Massey, Barrmoor Castle, Northumberland, Esq. July 1. Nicholson & Herbert, Spring-gardens.
Smith, Isaac, Edilston, Derbyshire, Yeoman. July 1. Fox, Ashbourne.
Terry, John, Cheltenham, Gloucestershire, Esq. Aug 2. Hebb, Lincoln.
Tomlinson, John, Thornton-leath, Surrey, Publican. July 1. Powell, King-street.
Vine, Fredk, St Leonards-on-sea, Sussex, Gent. June 24. Meadows, Hastings.

Weyland, Richd Hy, Jermyn-st, St James's, Esq. May 22. Dayman, & Walsh, Oxford.
Widdicombe, Hy, Kennington-pk-rd, Comedian. June 12. Semple, Manch.
Wilkinson, Wm, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Licensed Victualler. June 1. Hoyle & Co, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

TUESDAY, May 4, 1869.

Austen, Fedk Lewes, Hyde-pk-sq, Esq. July 1. Currie & Williams, Lincoln's-Inn-fields.
Barber, John, Ridgmount, Bedford, Victualler. June 15. Greene, Amphill.
Barton, Mary, Kingston-upon-Hull, Widow. May 31. Wilson, Kingston-upon-Hull.
Bell, Chas, Richmond, Esq, M.P. May 31. Sharp, Gresham-house, Old Broad-st.
Booth, Ann, Bishop Auckland, Durham, Widow. June 1. Thornton, Bishop Auckland.
Brown, John, Wareham, Dorset, Esq. July 1. Filliter, Wareham.
Chamberlin, Thos, sen, Willoughby Waterless, Leicester, Farmer. July 3. Watson & Baxter, Luttworth.
Chapman, Edwd Hy, Jeffrey's-sq, Esq. June 12. Park & Nelson, Essex-st, Strand.
Clifton, Sir Arthur Benj, Brighton, Sussex, General. July 1. Bennett & Co, New-sq, Lincoln's-Inn-fields.
Coltman, Wm, West Hartlepool, Durham, Brewer. May 20. Turnbull & Bell, West Hartlepool.
Dorington, Chas, Bride Hall, Hertford, Farmer. June 30. Spence & Hawks, Hertford.
Evelyn, Francis, Abbey-gardens, St John's-wood, Esq. June 15. Ford & Lloyd, Bloomsbury-sq.
Finnie, Anna, Clifton, Somerset, Widow. June 4. Annesley, Lincoln's-Inn-fields.
Hanks, Geo, Bath, Fork Butcher. July 3. Stone & Co, Bath.
Harrington, Esther, Brompton-rd, Widow. June 30. Myers, Berners-st, Oxford-st.
Henderson, Thos, Cumnwhinton, Cumberland, Timber Merchant. June 1. Bendle & Son, Carlisle.
Jackson, Sarah, Longton-grove, Upper Sydenham, Spinster. July 1. Upton & Co, Austin Friars.
Joyce, Chas, Lansdowne-cres, Kensington-pk, Esq. June 24. Wansey & Bowen, Moorgate-st.
Neighbour, Wm, Littlemore, Oxford, Gent. July 1. Mallam, Oxford.
Sagar, Wm, Seacombe, Chester, Gent. June 1. Morcroft, Lpool.
Sergeant, Jane Alice, Lordship-rd, Stoke Newington, Widow. Aug 2. Brook, New-Inn, Strand.
Selwin, Sir John Thos, Doan Hall, Harlow, Essex, Bart. June 5. Paterson, Chancery-lane.
Waites, John Merrick, Gloucester, Ironmonger. June 24. Bonnor, Gloucester.
Ward, Rev Edwd, Hawleigh, Suffolk, Clerk. June 16. Hayward & Co, Suffolk.
Wilson, John Simpson, Enthorpe, York, Farmer. July 1. Foster & Tonge, Gt Driffield.
Wood, Rachael, Kirkstall, Leeds, Widow. July 1. Simpson, Leeds.
Wyndham, Alex Wadham, Dinton, Wilts, Esq. June 1. Domville & Co, New-sq, Lincoln's-Inn.

Deeds registered pursuant to Bankruptcy Act, 1861.

FRIDAY, April 30, 1869.

Allman, Edwd Algernon, Bedford-st, Covent-garden, Publisher. April 19. Comp. Reg April 28.
Arnould, Sarah Anne, Brighton, Sussex, Milliner. April 1. Inspectorship. Reg April 28.
Ashby, Geo, Marston-upon-Dove, Derby, Farmer. March 24. Comp. Reg April 30.
Bennett, Danl, Upper Berkeley-st, Edgware-rd, House Decorator. April 7. Asst. Reg April 26.
Birch, Edwd, Lpool, Licensed Victualler. March 31. Asst. Reg April 28.
Bolton, Chas, Moreton-st, Pimlico, Furniture Dealer. April 27. Comp. Reg April 28.
Broadbridge, Geo, Lpool, General Broker. April 23. Asst. Reg April 29.
Brook, John, jun, Huddersfield, York, Cotton Spinner. April 9. Asst. Reg April 26.
Burrage, John, Norwiche, Tailor. April 7. Asst. Reg April 23.
Bushby, John, Gravesend, Kent, Agent to the Navigation Company. April 5. Comp. Reg April 24.
Carter, Fredk, Chichester, Sussex, Clothier. April 5. Comp. Reg April 28.
Chandler, John, & Jas Chandler, Brighton, Grocers. April 2. Asst. Reg April 28.
Chester, Thos, jun, Barrow-on-Humber, Lincoln, Attorney. March 23. Comp. Reg April 30.
Clewes, Thos Matthew, Bewdley, Worcester, Ironmonger. March 31. Comp. Reg April 28.
Clifton, John Moore, Tattenshall, Lincoln, Wms Merchant. April 1. Asst. Reg April 27.
Croskey, Joseph Rodney, King William-st, Merchant. April 26. Comp. Reg April 28.
Crutchley, Thos Chas, Wolverhampton, Stafford, Contractor. March 30. Comp. Reg April 28.
Cushion, Jas Chas, Old Kent-rd, Baker. April 19. Comp. Reg April 28.
Dalton, Wm Jas, Lpool, Dealer in Boots. April 10. Comp. Reg April 28.
Davies, John, Aberaman, Glamorgan, Grocer. April 1. Comp. Reg April 27.
Doiman, John, Sunbury, Middlesex, Licensed Victualler. April 12. Comp. Reg April 27.
Eaton, Saml, Kettering, Northampton, Shoe Manufacturer. March 24. Comp. Reg April 27.
Etches, Jacob, Wakefield, York, Ironmonger. April 1. Comp. Reg April 28.
Geach, Wm Francis, Penzance, Cornwall, Travelling Draper. April 10. Comp. Reg April 27.

Hall, Geo Lowthian, Elgin-rd, Maida-vale, Artist. March 20. Comp. Reg April 28.
 Hall, Edwin, Madeley, Staff'd, Builder. April 16. Comp. Reg April 30.
 Harris, Jas, Crawford-st, Bryanston-sq, Grocer. April 2. Comp. Reg April 29.
 Hartley, Jas, Burscough, Lancaster, Grocer. March 30. Asst. Reg April 30.
 Hetherington, Thos Geo, Gateshead, Durham, Painter. April 14. Asst. Reg April 29.
 Hiddleston, Robt Alex, Jubilee-st, Stepney, Draper. April 7. Asst. Reg April 29.
 Huddleston, Wm, Lincoln, Builder. April 1. Comp. Reg April 23.
 Hudson, Wm, Leamington Priors, Warwick, Druggist. April 10. Comp. Reg April 27.
 Hughes, Jas, Chorlton-upon-Medlock, Manch, Mechanical Engineer. April 24. Comp. Reg April 28.
 Jacobs, Joseph, Burton-upon-Trent, Stafford, Licensed Victualler. March 15. Comp. Reg April 27.
 Jacobsen, Rudolph Bernard, Lpool, Merchant. April 23. Asst. Reg April 29.
 Lang, Geo Lowman, Crewkerne, Somerset, Attorney. April 5. Asst. Reg April 27.
 Larkin, Wm Hy, Machynlleth, Montgomery. March 6. Asst. Reg April 29.
 Lazarus, Saml, Hatton-garden, Optician. April 7. Comp. Reg April 26.
 Leggo, Wm, Clifton-villas, Denmark-pk, South Norwood, Builder. April 21. Comp. Reg April 28.
 Low, David, Kingston-upon-Hull, Tailor. April 1. Comp. Reg April 20.
 Mears, John, Stockton, Durham, Auctioneer. March 28. Comp. Reg April 30.
 Mitchell, John, & Reuben Mitchell, Bradford, York, Worsted Spinners. March 29. Asst. Reg April 28.
 Organ, Chas, Wotton-under-Edge, Gloucester, Baker. April 17. Asst. Reg April 27.
 Paine, Chas, High-st, Camden-town, Draper. April 2. Asst. Reg April 23.
 Purrott, John, Acocks-green, Worcester, Builder. April 2. Asst. Reg April 29.
 Ridders, Hy, Sandhurst, Berks, Builder. March 25. Asst. Reg April 27.
 Sanders, Saml, Pilton, Devon, Woolstapler. April 2. Asst. Reg April 29.
 Scott, Joseph, Idle, York, Cloth Manufacturer. April 19. Comp. Reg April 28.
 Soulsby, Edwd, Waterloo, Northumberland, Grocer. April 23. Comp. Reg April 28.
 Tom, Wm, Rocksea, Cornwall, Farmer. April 23. Asst. Reg April 28.
 Trueman, Wm, Brockmoor, Stafford, Ironfounder. April 14. Comp. Reg April 27.
 Watson, John Percival, Lime-st, Merchant. April 15. Comp. Reg April 24.
 West, Robt, Leek, Stafford, Watch Maker. April 19. Comp. Reg April 26.
 Whitehouse, Wm, Pleck, nr Walsall, Grocer. April 26. Comp. Reg April 30.

TUESDAY, May 4, 1869.

Althaber, Hy, Cardiff, Glamorgan, Ship Chandler. March 22. Asst. Reg May 1.
 Appleton, Juliana, Cromar-cottage, Kilburn, Schoolmistress. April 5. Comp. Reg May 1.
 Archer, John, High Easter, Essex, Draper. April 5. Comp. Reg April 30.
 Bell, Thos Alfred, Wigan, Lancaster, Manufacturing Chemist. April 9. Comp. Reg April 30.
 Bethell, Geo, Upper Thames-st, Wholesale Ironmonger. April 26. Comp. Reg May 1.
 Birtwhistle, Joseph, Halifax, York, Woolstapler. April 14. Asst. Reg May 1.
 Blake, Edwd, Eltham, Kent, Grocer. April 23. Asst. Reg May 1.
 Blowersen, Benj, Church-st, Spitalfields, Hat Manufacturer. April 21. Comp. Reg April 30.
 Bromley, John, Rossett, Denbigh, Publican. April 6. Asst. Reg April 30.
 Burgis, Jas Isaac, Prescott, Lancaster, Draper. April 14. Asst. Reg May 1.
 Burness, Benj, Brentford, Middlesex, Carrier. April 5. Asst. Reg May 3.
 Burt, Arthur, Birm, Spoon Manufacturer. April 26. Asst. Reg May 3.
 Clarke, Peter, Burslem, Stafford, Grocer. April 5. Comp. Reg May 3.
 Collishaw, Geo, Kingston-upon-Hull, Grocer. April 13. Comp. Reg April 30.
 Dodge, Hubert, Forest-hill, Upholsterer. April 3. Asst. Reg May 1.
 Floris, Geo Brooke, New Oxford-st, Tabacconist. Feb 15. Comp. Reg May 3.
 Hamilton, Robt, Derby, Surgeon. March 27. Asst. Reg April 30.
 Howitt, John, Hesley, Sheffield, Grocer. April 14. Comp. Reg May 3.
 Huntley, Geo, Bristol, Confectioner. April 8. Comp. Reg May 3.
 Jenkins, Chas Hy, St Paul's-rd, Islington, Pattern Maker. April 21. Comp. Reg May 1.
 Jones, Robt, Cerrig y Druidon, Denbigh, Draper. April 2. Asst. Reg April 30.
 Joseph, Emanuel, Manchester, Stay Manufacturer. April 7. Asst. Reg May 3.
 Lockhart, Wm Edwd, Eaton-villas, Loughton, Insurance Clerk. April 13. Comp. Reg April 30.
 Lowrie, Julius, Fenchurch-st, Merchant. April 22. Comp. Reg May 3.
 Matthews, Wm, Hampstead, Olman. April 14. Comp. Reg May 3.
 Mitchell, Fras, & John Mitchell, Bradford, York, Worsted Spinners. April 3. Asst. Reg April 30.
 Moat, Geo Thos, & Wm Archbold Moat, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Common Brewers. April 3. Asst. Reg May 3.

Moon, Chas, Wolverhampton, Stafford, Hosier. April 3. Asst. Reg May 1.
 Nicholson, David, High-st, Wandsworth, Builder. April 5. Asst. Reg May 1.
 Norris, Jas, West Gorton, Lancaster, Butcher. April 27. Asst. Reg May 1.
 Ramsden, Joshua, Bradford, York, Wool Top Dealer. April 13. Comp. Reg May 3.
 Russell, Wm Chapman, Ashwood-bank, Worcester, Draper. May 30. Comp. Reg May 3.
 Salisbury, Thos, Horfield, Gloucester, Brush Manufacturer. April 23. Comp. Reg May 3.
 Scott, David, Viewsey, West Drayton, Coal Merchant. April 5. Comp. Reg April 30.
 Silvanus, Margaret, Wellington-pl, Holloway-rd Upholsterer. April 2. Asst. Reg April 30.
 Simms, Edward, Windsor-rd, Denmark-hill, Timber Merchant. April 3. Asst. Reg May 1.
 Smith, Benj, Tipton Kingswinford, Stafford, Grocer. April 8. Comp. Reg May 3.
 Smith, Joshua, Horbury, Wakefield, Chemist. April 22. Comp. Reg May 3.
 Smith, Hy, Lpool, Boot Dealer. April 27. Comp. Reg May 1.
 Stirling, Wm, Stockport, Chester, Stonemason. April 22. Asst. Reg April 30.
 Taylor, Mary, Bolton, Lancaster, Widow. April 21. Comp. Reg May 3.
 Trickett, Wm, & Robt Heys, Ewood-bridge, Lancaster, Cotton Manufacturers. April 20. Comp. Reg May 3.
 Vincent, John, Mount-row, Islington, Clothier. April 23. Comp. Reg April 30.
 Whiter, Walter, Cheapside, Trimming Manufacturer. April 21. Asst. Reg April 29.
 Wilkinson, Wm Hy, Chorlton-upon-Medlock, Manch, Warehousman. April 12. Comp. Reg May 1.
 Wills, Caroline, Sunderland, Durham, Hosier. April 13. Comp. Reg May 3.
 Wilson, Hy, Holbeck, nr Leeds, Joiner. April 9. Asst. Reg. April 30.
 Woodbridge, Stephen, Lower Norwood, Retailer of Wine. April 17. Asst. Reg April 30.
 Woolhouse, Hy, New Windsor, Berks, no occupation. April 29. Asst. Reg May 3.
 Woolison, Fredk Augustus, Leamington Priors, Warwick, Decorator. April 3. Asst. Reg May 4.
 Wolfson, Herman, Houndsditch, Jeweller. April 5. Comp. Reg May 1.

Sankrupts.

FRIDAY, April 30, 1869.

To Surrender in London.

Abell, Robt, Cottage-end, Hampshire, Horse Dealer. Pet April 26. Murray. May 24 at 12. Dobie, Gresham-st.
 Burchmore, Wm, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet April 24 (for pau). Pepps. May 21 at 12. Kimberley, Scots'-yard, Bush-lane.
 Catt, Edwin, Hastings, Sussex, Butcher. Pet April 26. May 12 at 1. Linklaters & Co, Wallbrook.
 Collison, Wm, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet April 24 (for pau). Murray. May 24 at 12. Edwards, Bush-lane, Cannon-st.
 Cottrell, Alfred Wm, Lewisham-rd, Greenwich, Tailor. Pet April 27. Pepps. May 21 at 2. Drake, Basinghall-st.
 Dabbs, Alfred, & John Alfred Clark, Castle-st East, Oxford-st, Importers of Foreign Goods. Pet April 25. May 19 at 11. Godfrey, South-sq, Gray's-inn.
 Daniels, Nathaniel, Brunswick-gardens, Kensington, out of business. Pet April 26. Murray. May 24 at 12. Mordon, Newgate-st.
 Deeley, Zachariah, Arcnot, Oxford, Wheelwright. Pet April 26. Murray. May 24 at 12. Haynes, Banbury.
 Giles, Maria, Cable-st, St George's-st, Asst, Baker. Pet April 27. Murray. May 24 at 1. Wood, Basinghall-st.
 Holmes, Fras, Robert-st, Chelsea, Baker. Pet April 27. Murray. May 24 at 12. Rice, Symond's-inn, Chancery-lane.
 Houston, Shore, Hartfield-rd, Wimbledon, Auctioneer. Pet April 23. Roche. May 26 at 11. Notley, Trinity-sq, Southwark.
 Lacey, Hy Richd, Spa-rd, Bermondsey, Lessee. Pet April 26. Pepps. May 21 at 1. Norman, Sackville-st, Regent-st.
 Lloyd, David, Portland-rd, Notting-hill, Ironmonger. Pet April 25. Pepps. May 21 at 12. Buchanan, Basinghall-st.
 Northcott, Edwd Chas, Marden, Kent, Farmer. Pet April 20. Roche. May 26 at 11. Thomson & Son, Cornhill.
 Omering, Theodor, Burdett-rd, Mile End-rd, Ironfounder. Pet April 27. May 19 at 12. Layton, jun, Navarino-cottage, Bow-rd.
 Perry, Walter Thos, Charles-st, Hatton-garden, Greengrocer. Pet April 26. May 19 at 11. Olive, Portsmouth-st, Lincoln's-inn-fields.
 Simons, Victor, Southampton-st, Pentonville, Bonnet Milliner. Pet April 23. Pepps. May 21 at 12. Padmore, Westminster Bridge-rd.
 Sinclair, Joseph, Park-pl, Liverpool-rd, Islington, out of business. Pet April 27. Pepps. May 21 at 1. Billing, Chapel-pl, Poultry.
 Snell, Fredk, Prisoner for Debt, Surrey. Pet April 27 (for pau). Roche. May 25 at 11. Kimberley, Scott's-yard, Bush-lane, Cannon-st.
 Thompson, Joseph Valentine Beckett, Giebo-pl, St Mary-st, Woolwich, Engineer. Pet April 24. May 12 at 1. Godfrey, Hatton-garden.
 Thornton, Hy, Mile End-rd, Baker. Pet April 27. Murray. May 24 at 1. Lund, Castle-st, Holborn.
 Williams, Albert John, Dover, Kent, Baker. Pet April 26. Pepps. May 21 at 1. Minter, Dover.

To Surrender in the Country.

Backhouse, Eliz, Prisoner for Debt, York. Adj April 17. Marshall Leeds, May 24 at 12. Whitley, Leeds.
 Bainbridge, Geo Neptune, Prisoner for Debt, Lancaster. Adj April 15. Lpool, May 13 at 11.
 Best, Thos, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Comm Agent. Pet April 23. Gibson, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, May 12 at 12. Harle & Co, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

- Beecroft, Elijah, Derby, out of business. Pet April 27. Weller, Derby, May 12 at 12. Briggs, Derby.
- Bowring, Abel, Tubyry Stafford, Groengrocer. Pet April 26. Hill, Birm, May 12 at 12. Hodgson & Son, Birm.
- Burnley, Saml, jun, & Walter Hammond, Batley Carr, York, Wool Merchants. Pet April 29. Leeds, May 13 at 11. Simpson, Leeds.
- Burton, Jas, Burton-upon-Trent, Stafford, Pet April 28. Hubbersty, Burton-upon-Trent, May 17 at 10. Wilson, Burton-on-Trent.
- Chapman, Thos, Dawley Bank, Salop, Grocer. Pet April 26. Madely, May 12 at 12. Walker, Wellington.
- Clothier, Chas, Bath, Lodging-house Keeper. Pet April 24. Smith, Bath, May 11 at 11. Bartrum, Bath.
- Crotes, Ann, Burton-upon-Trent, Stafford, Confect oner. Pet April 26. Hubbersty, Burton-upon-Trent, May 17 at 10. Wilson, Burton-upon-Trent.
- Cole, Geo, Olveston, nr Bristol, Grocer. Pet April 27. Wilde, Bristol, May 12 at 11. Brittan & Sons, Bristol.
- Collyer, Wm, Sheffield, York, Labourer. Pet April 24. Wake, Sheffield, May 12 at 11. Mickelthwait, Sheffield.
- Cooper, Jas, Handsworth, nr Birm, Coachman. Pet April 27. Guest, Birm, May 14 at 10. Sargent, Birm.
- Counsell, Robt, Pontypool, Monmouth, Contractor. Pet April 28. Wilde, Bristol, May 13 at 11. Beckingham, Bristol.
- Cross, Benj, Stone, Stafford, Publican. Adj April 10. Middleton, Stone, May 10 at 10.
- Cross, John Rowland, Taunton, Somerset, out of business. Pet April 20. Exeter, May 11 at 12. Rogers & Rogers, Exeter.
- Dales, Jas, Bishop Auckland, Durham, Hall Keeper. Pet April 26. Trotter, Bishop Auckland, May 11 at 3. Thornton, Bishop Auckland.
- Delfraine, Eugene, Chard, Somerset, Tutor. Pet April 27. Exeter, May 11 at 12.30. Tucker & Forward, Chard; Hirtzel, Exeter.
- Dennis, John, Grantham, Lincoln, Beersheep Keeper. Pet April 27. Thompson, Grantham, May 11 at 11. Malm, Grantham.
- Dickson, Amos, Wakefield, York, Boot Dealer. Pet April 28. Leeds, May 13 at 11. Walewright & Co, Wakefield; Bond & Barwick, Leeds.
- Downie, Thos, Newbiggen-by-the-Sea, Northumberland, Tailor. Pet April 23. Gibson, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, May 13 at 12. Scaife & Britton, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
- Dyke, Edwin, Stroud, Gloucester, Tailor. Pet April 27. Anderson, Stroud, May 11 at 10. Clutterbuck, Stroud.
- Ellis, Jas, Ossett, York, Cloth Manufacturer. Pet April 29. Leeds, May 13 at 11. Rider, Leeds.
- Elsworth, Thos, Carlisle, Cumberland, Commercial Traveller. Pet April 26. Halton, Carlisle, May 13 at 11. Wannop, Carlisle.
- Farrer, Robt Pollock, Leeds, General Merchant. Pet April 27. Leeds, May 13 at 11. Pullan, Leeds.
- Felix, Evan, Swansea, Glamorgan, Butcher. Pet April 26. Smith, Cardigan, May 14 at 11. Mitchell, Cardigan.
- Gill, Joseph, Shipley, York, Tailor. Pet April 27. Bradford, May 18 at 9.15. Harle, Leeds.
- Gordon, Chas, Edge-hill, Lpool, Boot Maker. Pet April 27. Hime, Lpool, May 11 at 2.30. Blackhurst-st.
- Groez, John, Bishop Auckland, Durham, Dealer in Glass. Pet April 28. Trotter, Bishop Auckland, May 11 at 3. Brignall, jun, Durham.
- Harding, Geo Danl, Ripley, Derby, Surgeon. Pet April 27. Tudor, Birm, May 11 at 11. Belk, Nottingham.
- Hewitt, Jas, Silverdale, Stafford, Grocer. Pet April 15. Hill, Birm, May 12 at 12. Litchfield, Newcastle-under-Lyme; James & Griffin, Birm.
- Hinds, Thos Fisher, Prisoner for Debt, Maidstone. Pet April 13. Callaway, Maidstone, May 18 at 11. Goodwin, Maidstone.
- Horsfall, Thos Middlebrook, Wednesbury, Stafford, Clerk in Holy Orders. Pet April 26. Gibson, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, May 13 at 12. Eglinton, Sunderland.
- Howell, Hy, Shrewsbury, Salop, Tailor. Pet April 28. Tudor, Birm, May 14 at 12. James & Griffin, Birm.
- Hoyle, Geo, sen, Rawtry, York, Machine Maker. Pet April 24. Shirley, Doncaster, May 14 at 12. Woodhead, Doncaster.
- Jakins, Wm, Luton, Bedford, Butcher. Pet April 26. Austin, Luton, May 11 at 10. Bailey, Luton.
- John, Elias, Swansea, Glamorgan, Grocer. Pet April 24. Morris, Swansea, May 10 at 2. Smith, Swansea.
- Johnson, John, Leeds, Grocer. Pet April 23. Leeds, May 13 at 11. Pullan, Leeds.
- Jones, John Whitley, Llangollen, Denbigh, Chemist. Pet April 26. Reid, Wrexham, May 14 at 12. Sherratt, Wrexham.
- Jones, Edwd, Mold, Flint, Saddler. Pet April 28. Lpool, May 11 at 12. Bellingier, Lpool.
- Jones, John Philip, Prisoner for Debt, Monmouth. Adj April 20. Wilde, Bristol, May 10 at 11.
- Loughton, Wm, Droitwich, Worcester, out of business. Pet April 23. Tomba, Droitwich, May 13 at 10. Corbet, Kidderminster.
- Lytford, John, Abingdon, Berks, Publican. Pet April 27. Sedgfield, Abingdon, May 20 at 10. Thompson, Oxford.
- McConville, Edwd, Lpool, Cork Cutter. Pet April 27. Hime, Lpool, May 12 at 2. Thornley, Lpool.
- Mercer, Hy, Blackburn, Lancastr, Grocer. Pet April 26. Fardell, Manch, May 11 at 12. Gardner, Manch.
- Mercer, Wm, Harlaston, Stafford, Saddler. Pet April 16. Shaw, Tamworth, May 3 at 11. Argyle, Tamworth.
- Metcalf, Chas, Stockton, Shoemaker. Pet April 28. Crosby, Stockton-on-Tees, May 12 at 11. Draper, Stockton-on-Tees.
- Minto, Jas, Usworth, Durham, Grocer. Pet April 28. Ingledow, Gateshead, May 13 at 11. Joel, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
- O'Neil, Patrick, Aberavon, Glamorgan, Licensed Victualler. Pet April 27. Morgan, Neth, May 17 at 11. Tennant, Aberavon.
- Ottewill, Hy, Derby, Painter. Pet April 21. Weller, Derby, May 12 at 12. Briggs, Derby.
- Owen, Eliz, Wistanow, Salop, Innkeeper. Pet April 19. Williams, Ludlow, May 19 at 10. Walker, Wellington.
- Parcell, Benj, Prisoner for Debt, Monmouth. Adj April 20. Wilde, Bristol, May 10 at 11.
- Paech, Chas, Tinwell, Rutland, Carpenter. Pet April 23. Shield, Stamford, May 14 at 11. Laxton, Stamford.
- Pollard, John Hall, Worcester, Butcher. Pet April 28. Hill, Birm, May 12 at 12. Allen, Birm.
- Reay, John, Prisoner for Debt, Stafford. Pet April 26. Walsall, May 13 at 12. Cramp, Walsall.
- Rees, John Phillip, Hircwall, Brecknock, Grocer. Pet April 26. Rees, Aberdare, May 11 at 11. Rosser, Aberdare.
- Reeves, Chas, Birm, Sword Cutter. Pet April 24. Tudor, Birm, May 14 at 12. Barlow & Smith, Birm.
- Ricketts, Saml, Lpool, out of business. Pet April 27. Lpool, May 13 at 11. Eddy, Lpool.
- Roe, Hy, Sheffield, Draper. Pet April 27. Lpool, May 10 at 12. Chambers & Son, Sheffield.
- Scholefield, Joseph, & John Stafford, Ossett, York, Cloth Manufacturers. Pet April 28. Leeds, May 13 at 11. Stringer, Ossett; Bond & Barwick, Leeds.
- Sharp, John, Bradford, York, Wool Dealer. Pet April 27. Bradford, May 11 at 9.15. Hill, Bradford.
- Short, John, Lpool, Weighing Machine Maker. Pet April 15. Hime, Lpool, May 11 at 2. Thornley, Lpool.
- Simpson, Thos, Darlington, Durham, Hair Dresser. Pet April 22. Bowes, Darlington, May 10 at 10. Walestall, Darlington.
- Smith, Chas, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Provision Merchant. Pet April 24. Gibson, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, May 13 at 12. Hoyle & Co, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
- Smith, John, Prisoner for Debt, York. Adj April 17. Leeds, May 10 at 11.
- Smith, John Phillips, Wolverhampton, Stafford, Agricultural Engineer. Pet April 26. Tudor, Birm, May 14 at 12. H. & J. E. Underhill, Wolverhampton; Green, Birm.
- Starbuck, John, Barlestone, Leicester, Batcher. Pet April 21. Loseby, Market Bosworth, May 13 at 3. Tippetts, Atherstone.
- Stevenson, Geo, Norton, York, Coach Builder. Pet April 28. Jackson, New Malton, May 18 at 11. Walker & Langborne, New Malton.
- Taylor, Wm, Wolverhampton, Stafford, Boatman. Pet April 26. Brown, Wolverhampton, May 10 at 12. Stratton, Wolverhampton.
- Thomas, Jas Roger, Prisoner for Debt, Monmouth. Adj April 29. Wilde, Bristol, May 10 at 11.
- Thompson, Mark, jun, Sunderland, Durham, Attorney. Pet April 28. Ellis, Sunderland, May 14 at 11. Eglinton, Sunderland.
- Trotter, Hy, Swansea, Glamorgan, Director. Pet April 27. Wilde, Bristol, May 13 at 11. Lawrence & Co, Old Jewry-chambers; Press & Inskip, Bristol.
- Wearing, Chas, Prisoner for Debt, Lancaster. Adj April 15. Lpool, May 13 at 11.
- Whitehead, Hy, Nottingham, Lace Maker. Pet April 27. Patchitt, Nottingham, May 19 at 10.30. Smith, Nottingham.
- Wilson, John, Bromyard, Hereford, out of business. Pet April 26. Crisp, Worcester, May 13 at 11. Clutterbuck, Worcester.
- Wool, Joseph, Lathes Mill, Skelton, Cumberland, Miller. Pet April 25. Varty, Penrith, May 12 at 10. Graham, Penrith.

TUESDAY, May 4, 1869.

To Surrender in London.

- Arthur, Walter, Kennington-rd, Surgeon. Pet May 1. May 24 at 11. Norton, Clifford's-inn.
- Bagnall, John, New Wellington-st, St James's-rd, Holloway, Boot-maker. Pet April 30. May 24 at 11. Strutt, Adelphi-ter, Strand.
- Bates, Wm, Kew-rd, Richmond, Carman. Pet May 1. Roche, May 28 at 1. Miller & Stubbs, Eastcheap.
- Braham, Hy Jas, Cannon-st, Rag Merchant. Pet April 27. Pepps, May 21 at 2. Kynaston & Co, King's Arm's-yard, Moorgate-st.
- Broadbridge, Chas, Stanhope-st, Hampstead-rd, Surveyor. Pet April 29. Pepps, May 21 at 1. Gaussett, New Broad-st.
- Bucknall, Jas, Lower Charles-st, Clerkenwell, Goldbeater. Pet April 29. May 19 at 1. Wedlake & Letts, King's Bench-walk, Temple.
- Burrell, Chas, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet April 23 (for pau). Pepps, May 29 at 12. Kimberley, Scott's-yard, Bush-lane.
- Coltman, Wm, Southgate-rd, De Beauvoir-town, Kingsland, Chin Dealer. Pet April 22. Pepps, May 27 at 2. Ingle & Co, City Bank chambers, Threadneedle-st.
- Crambrook, Edwd, Chancery-lane, Warehouseman. Pet April 14. Marray, May 24 at 1. Haxden, Friday-st.
- D'Alayrac, Junia Maria, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet April 26. May 19 at 11. Goughgan, Lincoln's-inn-fields.
- Davies, Edwd, Waterloo-pl, Camden-grove North, Peckham, General Shop Keeper. Pet April 29. Pepps, May 27 at 12. Nash, Arlington-st, New North-rd, Islington.
- Dingley, Wm, Camberwell New-rd, Coal Merchant. Adj April 4. Roche, May 26 at 1. Roy & Cartwright, Lothbury.
- Elliott, Edwd, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet April 13. Roche, May 26 at 12. Webb, Gresham-st.
- Gill, John, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet April 29 (for pau). Brugham, May 19 at 1. Gostley, Bow-st, Covent-garden.
- Gillings, Jas, & Jas Tubby, Gt Yarmouth, Norfolk, Builders. Pet April 30. Pepps, May 27 at 1. Rhodes & Co, Chancery-lane.
- Gay, Mary Ann, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet April 30 (for pau). Pepps, May 27 at 2. Watson, Basinghall-st.
- Harrison, Hy, Michael Wm Spratley, & Thos Baldwin, Southwark Bridge-rd, Newspaper Proprietors. Pet April 28. Pepps, May 21 at 2. Cooke, Gresham-bldgs, Basinghall-st.
- Hind, Thos, Sandy, Bedford, Farmer. Pet May 1. Roche, May 26 at 12. Parker & Co, Bedford-rd.
- Horsnell, Fredk John, Belle Vue-ter, Seven Sisters-rd, Hairdresser. Pet April 29. Pepps, May 21 at 2. Cattell, Bedford-row.
- Hoy, John, Queen's-ter, York-rd, Battersea, Clothier. Pet April 27. May 19 at 12. Wood, Basinghall-st.
- Hutchinson, Geo Jas, Upper st, Islington, Bootmaker. Pet April 27. May 19 at 12. Poole, Bartholomew-close.
- Isenden, Thos Burren, Prisoner for Debt, Surrey. Pet April 29. Roche, May 26 at 11. Heathfield, Lincoln's-inn-fields.
- Lamb, Hy Saunders, Oxford-st, Licensed Victualler. Pet April 28. Pepps, May 21 at 12. Froggatt, Argyle-st, Regent-st.
- Lister, Hy Jas, West Smithfield, Tailor's Foreman. Pet April 27. Pepps, May 21 at 1. Barron, Queen-st.
- Mackintosh, Fras Hy Pottinger, Norris-st, Haymarket, Merchant. Pet April 27. Pepps, May 21 at 2. Reed & Co, Gresham-st. Bateman & Co, Lpool.
- Miller, Jas, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet April 29 (for pau). May 24 at 11. Kimberley, Scott's-yard, Bush-lane.

Perry, John, Queen's-st, Seven Dials, Licensed Hawker. Pet April 30. Roche. May 26 at 12. Godfrey, Hatton-garden.
 Rogers, Ishmael, jun, High-st, Camden-town, Boot Manufacturer. Pet April 26. May 19 at 11. Payne, Bedford-row.
 Schmidt, Adolph, Charlotte-st, Fitzroy-sq, Cabinet Maker. Pet April 29. Roche. May 26 at 11. Godfrey, Hatton-garden.
 Simmons, Thos, Craven-rd, Faddington, Upholsterer. Pet April 29. Murray. May 24 at 1. Davidson & Co, Basinghall-st.
 Sims, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet April 29 (for pau). Roche. May 26 at 12. Kimberley, Scott's-yard, Bush-Isle, Cannon-st.
 Spencer, John, Rathbone-pl, St Pancras, Watchmaker. Pet April 23. Pepps. May 27 at 1. Boulton & Sons, Northampton-sq.
 Tallet, Auguste, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet April 30 (for pau). Pepps. May 27 at 2. Watson, Basinghall-st.
 Watkins, Chas Dean, Essex-st, Islington, Grocer's Assistant. Pet April 29. May 19 at 1. Kane, Westbourne-pk-crescent.
 Wals, John, High-st, Poplar, Mat Manufacturer. Pet April 30. Pepps. May 27 at 12. Brown, Weaver's Hall, Basinghall-st.
 Woulham, John, Ewell Mill, Surrey, Miller. Pet April 26. Pepps. May 21 at 1. Michael, Gresham-bldgs, Basinghall-st.
 Wood, Fredk, Old Kent-rd, Assistant to a Butcher. Pet April 29. Roche. May 26 at 12. Cooke, Gresham-bldgs, Guildhall.

To Surrender in the Country.

Alford, Alfred, Landport, Southampton, Confectioner. Pet April 27. Howard. Portsmouth, May 14 at 12. Champ, Fortsea.
 Baker, Wm Geo, Stourbridge, Worcester, Grocer. Pet April 30. Tudor. Birm. May 14 at 12. Bernard & King, Stourbridge; James & Griffin, Birm.
 Chadwick, John, Huncoat, Lancaster, out of business. Pet April 20. Woodcock. Haslingden, May 15 at 10.30. Hartley, Burnley.
 Childs, Hy, Portlady-by-Sea, Sussex, Builder. Pet April 30. Ever-shed. Brighton, May 20 at 11. Mills, Brighton.
 Cooper, Alfred John, Downham, Cambridge, General-shop Keeper. Pet April 26. Hall. Ely, May 13 at 11. Cross, Ely.
 Caithbertson, Jas, Trindon Colliery, Durham, Grocer. Pet April 29. Greenwell. Durham, May 13 at 11. Marshall, jun, Durham.
 Dalby, Julius, Ecclehill, York, Bookseller. Pet April 23. Bradford, May 14 at 9.15. Hill, Bradford.
 Drinkwater, Thos, Holbrook, Levenshulme, Lancaster, Draper. Adj April 14. Kay. Manch, June 8 at 9.30.
 Foster, Thos, Sheffield, Beer Retailer. Pet April 21. Wake. Sheffield, May 19 at 1. Sugg, Sheffield.
 Glyn, John Fox, Manch, Agent. Pet April 22. Fardell. Manch, May 26 at 12. Robinson, Manch.
 Gott, Thos, Windermere, Westmorland, Painter. Pet April 23. Fisher. Ambleside, May 19 at 12. Nicholson, Ambleside.
 Grainger, John, Handsworth, Stafford, Beerhouse Keeper. Pet April 27. Watson. Oldbury, May 24 at 10. Ebsworth, Wednesbury.
 Haines, Mary Nancy Alice, Round's-green, Worcester, out of business. Pet April 30. Walker. Dudley, May 20 at 12. Lowe, Dudley.
 Harvey, Jas, jun, Prisoner for Debt, Bristol. Pet April 30. Wilde. Bristol, May 14 at 11. Brittan & Son, Bristol.
 Hawkey, John Carpenter, Newquay, Cornwall, no business. Pet April 29. Collins. St. Columb Major, May 12 at 10. Nicholls, St. Columb Major.
 Herbert, Wm Wallace, Prisoner for Debt, Walton. Adj March 19. Lpool, May 14 at 11.
 Horton, Joseph, Aston, nr Birm, General Comm Agent. Adj April 22. Mitchell. Solihull, May 10 at 10.
 Keene, Fredk Joseph, Eversech, Somerset, Surgeon. Pet April 29. Wilde. Bristol, May 14 at 11. Michael, Gresham-bldgs, Basinghall-st; Abbott & Leonard, Bristol.
 Kendall, Richd, Saltney, nr Chester, Publican. Pet April 30. Lpool, May 20 at 12. Churton, Chester.
 Kershaw, Geo, Westbromwich, Stafford, Tailor. Pet April 27. Watson. Oldbury, May 15 at 10. Jackson, Westbromwich.
 Ketteringham, Wm, Newtown, Worcester, out of business. Pet April 29. Crisp. Worcester, May 18 at 11. Tree, Worcester.
 Lloyd, Fras, Prisoner for Debt, Walton. Adj April 16. Lpool, May 24 at 11.
 Lockett, Jas, Hanley, Stafford, Brickmaker. Pet April 29. Hill. Birm, May 19 at 12. Ward & Co, Newcastle-under-Lyne; James & Griffin, Birm.
 Marsh, David, Tranmere, Chester, Butcher. Pet April 30. Wason. Birkenhead, May 14 at 10. Downham, Birkenhead.
 Mercer, Edwd, Ossett, York, Stonemason. Pet April 29. Nelson. Dewsbury, May 20 at 3. Stringer, Ossett.
 Moir, John, Lpool, Draper. Pet April 29. May 20 at 11. Nordon, Lpool.
 Moss, Benj Woolf, Fortsea, Hants, Outfitter. Pet April 27. Howard. Portsmouth, May 14 at 12. Ford, Fortsea.
 Parbery, John, sen, Northampton, out of business. Pet April 26. Dennis. Northampton, May 15 at 10. White, Northampton.
 Redding, Walter, Worcester, Blacksmith. Pet April 26. Crisp. Worcester, May 18 at 11. Tree, Worcester.
 Roberts, Thos, Brynmawr, Brecon, Licensed Victualler. Pet April 29. Wilde. Bristol, May 15 at 11. Press & Inskip, Bristol.
 Robinson, Wm Clark, Tichmarsh, Northampton, Grocer. Pet May 1. Hawkins. Thrapston, May 20 at 11. Henry, Wellingborough.
 Shaw, Benj, Hartlepool, Durham, Innkeeper. Pet April 30. Child. Hartlepool, May 17 at 11. Todd, Hartlepool.
 Shelby, Jas, Wolverhampton, Stafford, Coal Merchant. Pet April 30. Tudor. Birm, May 14 at 12. Barrow, Wolverhampton.
 Smith, Wm, Brierley-hill, Worcester, Blacksmith. Pet April 30. Walker. Dudley, May 20 at 12. Clulow, Brierley-hill.
 Stanley, Harry James, Redditch, Worcester, out of business. Pet April 30. Browning, Redditch, May 17 at 11. Simons, Redditch.
 Stear, Emma Sophia, Kingsbridge, Devon, Innkeeper. Pet April 23. Square. Kingsbridge, May 12 at 11. Davis, Kingsbridge.
 Thompson, Robt, Halstead, Essex, Boot Maker. Pet April 30. Harris. Halstead, May 17 at 10. Cardinal, Halstead.
 Tomkins, Wm, Birm, Gold Beater. Pet March 11. Guest. Birm, May 14 at 10. East, Birm.
 Ward, Wm, Birm, Comm Agent. Pet April 30. Hill. Birm, May 19 at 12. Barnes, Lichfield; Reese & Harris, Birm.
 Warren, Edwd, Prisoner for Debt, Warwick. Adj April 22. Guest. Birm, May 14 at 10.

Whincup, Matthew Todd, Heatley, Chester, Stuff Merchant. Pet May 3. Macrae. Manch, May 14 at 12. Gardner, Manch.

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

FRIDAY, April 30, 1869.

Hopkinson, Joseph Timothy, Newington-causeway, Saw Maker. April 27.

Miller, Mark, Winchester, Hants, Land Agent. April 27.
 Quixley, Wm, Canterbury-pl, Lambeth, out of business. Dec 23.

TUESDAY, May 4, 1869.

Hall, Geo Lowthian, Elgin-rd, Maida-vale, Artist. May 1.

GRESHAM LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY,

37, OLD JEWRY, LONDON, E.C.

SOLICITORS are invited to introduce, on behalf of their clients, Proposals for Loans on Freehold or Leasehold Property, Reversions, Life Interests, or other adequate securities.

Proposals may be made in the first instance according to the following form:—

PROPOSAL FOR LOAN ON MORTGAGES.

Date.....
 Introduced by (state name and address of solicitor)
 Amount required £
 Time and mode of repayment (i.e., whether for a term certain, or by annual or other payments)
 Security (state shortly the particulars of security, and, if land or building, state the net annual income).
 State what Life Policy (if any) is proposed to be effected with the Gresham Office in connection with the security.
 By order of the Board,
 F. ALLAN CURTIS, Actuary and Secretary.

BOOK-KEEPING FOR SOLICITORS, by Double-Entry (Alternative Methods), by G. J. KAIN, F.S.S., of the firm of Kain, Sparrow, Witt, & Co., Law Accountants and Costs Draftsmen, 69, Chancery-lane, W.C.

Single Column system } In one volume, 7s. 6d.
 Double " }
 Triple " } 8th edition, 6s.

To be obtained from the Publishers, WATERLOW & SONS, London-wall, and through all booksellers.

SLACK'S SILVER ELECTRO PLATE is a coating of pure Silver over Nickel. A combination of two metals possessing such valuable properties renders it in appearance and wear equal to Sterling Silver.

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Table Forks, per doz.....	1	10	0	and 1	18	0	2	4	0	2	10	0
Dessert ditto	1	0	0	and 1	10	0	1	12	0	1	15	0
Table Spoons	1	10	0	and 1	18	0	2	4	0	2	10	0
Dessert ditto	1	0	0	and 1	10	0	1	12	0	1	15	0
Tea Spoons	0	12	0	and 0	18	0	1	2	0	1	5	0

Every Article for the Table as in Silver. A Sample Tea Spoon forwarded on receipt of 2d stamps.

RICHARD & JOHN SLACK, 336, STRAND, LONDON.

SLACK'S FENDER AND FIRE-IRON WARE-

HOUSE is the MOST ECONOMICAL, consistent with good quality:—Iron Fenders, 3s. 6d.; Bronzed ditto, 8s. 6d., with standards; superior Drawing-room ditto, 14s. 6d. to 50s.; Fire Irons, 2s. 6d. to 20s. Patent Dish Covers, with handles to take off, 18s. set of six. Table Knives and Forks, 8s. per dozen. Roasting Jacks, complete, 7s. 6d. Tea-trays, 1s. 6d. set of three; elegant Paper Maché ditto, 25s. the set. Teapots, with plated knob, 5s. 6d.; Coal Scuttles, 2s. 6d. A set of Kitchen Utensils for cottage, £3. Slack's Cutlery has been celebrated for 50 years. Ivory Table Knives, 14s., 16s., and 18s. per dozen. White Bone Knives and Forks, 8s. 9d. and 12s.; Black Horn ditto, 8s. and 10s. All warranted.

As the limits of an advertisement will not allow of a detailed list, purchasers are requested to send for their Catalogue, with 350 drawings, and prices of Electro-Plate, Warranted Table Cutlery, Furnishing Ironmongery, &c. May be had gratis or post free. Every article marked in plain figures at the same low prices for which their establishment has been celebrated for nearly 50 years. Orders above £2 delivered carriage free per rail.

RICHARD & JOHN SLACK, 336, STRAND, LONDON, Opposite Somerset House.

Now ready, price 6d., by post 7d.,

"THE FINAL," No. 1, containing the Questions of the Final Examination of Easter Term, 1869, with the Answers. By EDWARD HENSLOWE BEDFORD, Solicitor, 9, King's Bench-walk, Temple.

STEVENS & SONS, 119, Chancery-lane.

BILLS OF COMPLAINT, ANSWERS, APPEALS, MINUTES, and all Law Printing, executed with promptitude and at moderate charges by

YATES & ALEXANDER, LAW PRINTERS,

7, Symonds-inn (and at Church-passage), Chancery-lane, London.

YATES AND ALEXANDER, PRINTERS,

7, Symonds-inn (and at Church-passage), Chancery-lane, E.C. Parliamentary Bills, Appeals, Bills of Complaint, Memorandums and Articles of Association, Legal Forms, Notices, &c. Prospectuses of Public Companies, Share Certificates, Show Cards, Cheques, Insurance Tables, Policies, Proposal Forms. Catalogues, Particulars and Conditions of Sale, Posting Bills, and all General Printing.